

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH CENTRAL COAST AREA  
89 SOUTH CALIFORNIA ST., SUITE 200  
VENTURA, CA 93001  
(805) 585-1800



**DATE:** December 29, 2003  
**TO:** Commissioners and Interested Persons  
**FROM:** Charles Damm, Senior Deputy Director  
Gary Timm, District Manager  
Melanie Hale, Supervisor, Planning and Regulation  
Shana Gray, Coastal Program Analyst  
**SUBJECT:** Santa Barbara County Local Coastal Program Amendment No. MAJ-2-02 (Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse) for Public Hearing and Commission Action at the January 14, 2004, Commission Meeting in Laguna Beach.

### **DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBMITTAL**

Santa Barbara County is requesting an amendment to the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan portions of its certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) to modify greenhouse policies and add an overlay district to all agricultural parcels zoned Agriculture I (AG-I) within the unincorporated areas of the coastal zone of the Carpinteria Valley (Exhibit 12). The purpose of the amendment is to regulate greenhouses, greenhouse related development, packing and shipping facilities, and shade and hoop structures, and to relieve the County and applicants of the requirement of obtaining a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), appealable to the Commission for greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley if the LCP amendment is certified. The CUP requirement was established in the LCP in 1981 at the time of LUP certification.

**STAFF NOTE:** This LCP amendment was continued by the Commission from the April 10, 2003 hearing. The one-year time extension expires February 10, 2004 and ***therefore the Commission must act upon the subject LCP amendment at the January hearing.***

**MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS:** Pages 9-11.

### **SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff is recommending that the Commission, after public hearing, ***deny*** the amendment to the certified LCP as submitted; then ***approve, only if modified***, the amendment to the LCP. The modifications are necessary because, as submitted, the LCP amendment is not adequate to ensure consistency with the policies of the certified Land Use Plan and applicable policies of the Coastal Act.

The pending LCP amendment stems from a provision of Santa Barbara County's certified LCP, incorporated in the LCP at the time of Commission certification (1982) that states in pertinent part:

***... In order to adequately assess the potential individual and cumulative impacts of greenhouse development on the coastal resources of the Carpinteria Valley, the County should conduct a master environmental impact assessment for the Valley to determine the level of greenhouse development that the Valley's resources can support without experiencing adverse environmental impacts. The County shall seek funding for the preparation of the master environmental impact assessment during the implementation phase of the Local Coastal Program. If the master environmental impact assessment is not completed within three years of the certification of the County's land use plan, greenhouse development (as regulated by Policy 8-5) shall automatically become a conditional use on Agriculture I designated lands in the Carpinteria Valley. If, however, the County and Coastal Commission agree on land use designation or policy changes based on the County's assessment of adverse environmental impacts of greenhouses gathered through the permit process, conditional use permits shall not be required for greenhouse development.***

The Carpinteria Valley has attributes that make it particularly suitable for agricultural, including mild climatic conditions, prime agricultural soils, available water sources, and proximity to major markets. These conditions are similarly advantageous to growers using greenhouse methods because of the solar exposure and mild climate which contribute to easier and cheaper regulation of greenhouse temperature. Thus greenhouse agriculture has been most intensively developed in the Carpinteria Valley though demand has begun to spread to other County areas and may increase in the wake of this LCP amendment, as discussed in the findings.

The proposed amendment will result in the addition of an overlay district to identify the location and intensity of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley where unique public viewsheds, prime agriculture, natural assets and community character require protection under the Coastal Act. The overlay district is also intended to designate areas of agricultural lands in the Carpinteria Valley appropriate to support future greenhouse development.

The overlay district is applied differently in Area "A" and Area "B" of the overlay district. Area "A" of the Carpinteria Agricultural (CA) Overlay District encompasses approximately 664 acres of AG-I zoned land located south of Highway 192, east of Nidever Road and west of Linden Avenue (Exhibit 12). Area "A" within the CA Overlay District allows for future expansion of greenhouses and greenhouse related development with a development cap of 2.75 million sq. ft. (63 acres) for all greenhouse and greenhouse-related development, with the exception of shade structures. Approximately 9.1 million sq. ft. of greenhouse development have previously been constructed in Area A, and pursuant to the pending LCP amendment, 2.75 million additional square feet would be allowed.

Area “B” of the CA Overlay District is comprised of all remaining parcels not covered by Area “A” in the Overlay District, encompassing approximately 4,972 acres of AG-I zoned land (Exhibit 12). Area “B” limits the area per lot that may be utilized for new greenhouses, greenhouse related development, packing and shipping facilities, shade structures, and hoop structures to *less than 20,000 sq. ft.* of cumulative development. Approximately 5.8 million sq. ft. of greenhouse development have previously been constructed in Area B (including greenhouse development much larger than 20,000 sq. ft. that would be “grandfathered” under the pending amendment). The County has not quantified the additional sq. ft. of greenhouse development that would result from buildout in Area B.

At 14.9 million square feet, the Carpinteria Valley Planning area is a predominate greenhouse area in Santa Barbara County. This was a big issue during the development of the LCP in the late 1970’s and early 1980s due to the growth of greenhouse development that was already evident in the Carpinteria Valley. At the time of the LCP certification, greenhouse and greenhouse related development in the Carpinteria Valley was approximately eight million square feet. The total has nearly doubled since certification. Because of the adverse impacts to the environment from this structural agriculture, the certified LCP had special provisions for Carpinteria Valley. The most important of these provisions was that if the County did not undertake substantive review of the impacts of greenhouse agriculture, including cumulative impacts, on the Carpinteria Valley, within three years of LUP certification (by approximately 1985), then all further greenhouse projects were to require a CUP, appealable to the Commission.

The County overlooked this requirement until advised by the Commission in 1998 that CUPs were not only required but that the Commission would likely appeal each one processed until the County addressed greenhouse development in the manner set forth in the certified LCP. Subsequently, and with Commission funding, the County initiated the planning project that resulted in the pending LCP amendment.

The potential buildout of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley, if it continues under present trends and regulation, has the potential to transform the rural valley to a structured, quasi-industrial landscape. The incremental conversion of the open space to a structural developed landscape, if not controlled, has the potential to adversely impact the scenic and visual qualities and overall rural character of the Carpinteria Valley.

The issues associated with the growth and expansion of greenhouse development is not limited to the Carpinteria Valley alone within the Santa Barbara County coastal zone. This issue must be considered in the broader context of the entire LCP geographic jurisdiction, particularly all areas designated for agricultural development. It is clear, based on prior history of greenhouse development within the Carpinteria Valley, concerns raised by growers relative to proposed limitations (i.e. development cap) on greenhouse development, technological reasons for utilizing greenhouses relative to climate and productivity, and more recent proposals for greenhouse development along Patterson Avenue (1.5 million sq. ft. of greenhouse development) that the demand for

greenhouse development will increase in the future. While more than 2.75 million sq. ft. of additional greenhouse development will be allowed in Area A of the Carpinteria Valley as a result of this amendment this additional capacity will not meet all future demand for greenhouse development within the County. Further, as provided in the subject LCP amendment, greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley will be subject to additional policies and regulations to address and mitigate the potential adverse impacts on maintaining the productivity of prime agricultural lands, visual resources, and water quality. Although the County's LCP does contain policies which address these issues, no specific policies that address these issues relative to greenhouse development in particular exist within the LCP for agricultural areas outside of the Carpinteria Valley. Because of the demand driven potential for expansion of greenhouse development in the County and the unique nature of the impacts and issues associated with greenhouses, as demonstrated by development within the Carpinteria Valley over the past 20 years, it is important that the LCP recognize and address these issues throughout the County coastal zone and not just within the Carpinteria Valley. Therefore, additional modifications are proposed which add a policy that requires a Conditional Use Permit, along with specific findings which must be made in order to approve the CUP, for any proposed greenhouse or greenhouse related development that exceeds 20,000 sq. ft. in size on any parcel within the County's LCP jurisdiction outside of the Carpinteria Valley.

#### **SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS**

Resolution No. 02-061 of the Board of Supervisors, County of Santa Barbara, State of California, *In the matter of adopting amendments to the Santa Barbara County Local Coastal Program to adopt the Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program*, passed, approved, and adopted by the Board of Supervisors February 19, 2002; Ordinance 4446, *Case Number 99-RZ-009*, adopted by Board of Supervisors February 19, 2002; Ordinance 4445, *Case Number 99-OA-005*, adopted by the Board of Supervisors February 19, 2002; Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Study Options Paper (Santa Barbara County Planning and Development, February 5, 1999); Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program Revised Final Environmental Impact Report (Santa Barbara County Planning & Development, February 2002);

**Additional Information:** Please contact Shana Gray, California Coastal Commission, South Central Coast Area, 89 So. California St., Second Floor, Ventura, CA. (805) 585-1800.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. PROCEDURAL ISSUES.....</b>	<b>8</b>
A. STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	8
B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION .....	8
C. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS .....	9
<b>II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION, MOTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAND USE PLAN/COASTAL PLAN (LUP/CP).....</b>	<b>9</b>
A. DENIAL AS SUBMITTED .....	9
B. CERTIFICATION WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS .....	10
<b>III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION, MOTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/COASTAL ZONING ORDINANCE (IP/CZO) .....</b>	<b>10</b>
A. DENIAL AS SUBMITTED .....	11
B. CERTIFICATION WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS .....	11
<b>IV. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS ON THE LAND USE PLAN/COASTAL PLAN (LUP/CP).....</b>	<b>12</b>
1. Development Location .....	12
2. Lot coverage .....	12
3. Maximum Slope.....	13
4. Prime Agricultural Soils .....	13
5. Subdivision Intensification.....	13
6. Alternative Transportation .....	13
7. Conditional Use Permit .....	14
<b>V. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/COASTAL ZONING ORDINANCE (IP/CZO) .....</b>	<b>15</b>
8. Area Boundaries .....	15
9. Processing.....	15
10. Submittal Requirements .....	16
11. Lot Coverage.....	16
12. Maximum Slope.....	17
13. Prime Agricultural Soils .....	17
14. Subdivision Intensification.....	17
15. Development Standards Landscaping .....	18
16. Visual Resources .....	18
17. Development Standards Water Quality .....	19
18. Development Standards for Residential Setbacks .....	23
19. Abandonment .....	23
20. Conditional Use Permit .....	23

<b>VI. FINDINGS FOR DENIAL AS SUBMITTED AND APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM IF MODIFIED AS SUGGESTED .....</b>	<b>26</b>
A. AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION .....	26
1. LUP Amendment .....	27
2. IP/CZO Amendment .....	28
B. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE .....	31
C. PAST COMMISSION ACTION .....	32
D. AGRICULTURE.....	33
1. Coastal Act Policies.....	33
2. Existing LUP Policies.....	35
3. Existing IP/CZO Provisions.....	37
4. Discussion.....	38
E. VISUAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC ACCESS .....	49
1. Coastal Act Policies.....	49
2. Existing LUP Policies.....	50
3. Existing IP/CZO Provisions.....	51
4. Discussion.....	52
F. WATER QUALITY .....	64
1. Coastal Act Policies.....	64
2. Existing LUP Policies.....	65
3. Existing IP/CZO Policies.....	66
4. Discussion.....	67
G. NEW DEVELOPMENT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	74
1. Coastal Act Policies.....	74
2. Existing LUP Policies.....	75
3. Existing IP/CZO Provisions.....	77
4. General Discussion.....	78
5. Greenhouse Development Permitting.....	79
6. Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Development.....	81
7. Countywide Greenhouse Development.....	86
<b>VII. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT .....</b>	<b>91</b>

## **LIST OF EXHIBITS**

- Exhibit 1. County Resolution 02-061; Proposed LUP Amendments**
- Exhibit 2. Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments (Ordinance No. 4445)**
- Exhibit 3. Proposed Zoning Map Amendment (Ordinance No. 4446)**
- Exhibit 4. Zoning Code Section 35-172 Conditional Use Permits**
- Exhibit 5. Zoning Code Section 35-174 Development Plans**
- Exhibit 6. LUP Section 3.8 Agriculture**
- Exhibit 7. Zoning Code Section 35-68 Agriculture I**
- Exhibit 8. Zoning Code Section 35-162 Nonconforming Buildings and Structures**
- Exhibit 9. Central Coast RWQCB Staff Report**
- Exhibit 10. Regional Location Map**
- Exhibit 11. Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program Study Area Map**
- Exhibit 12. Proposed LCP Amendment Map**
- Exhibit 13. Soils Map**
- Exhibit 14. Slope Map**

## **I. PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

### **A. STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Coastal Act provides:

***The commission shall certify a land use plan, or any amendments thereto, if it finds that a land use plan meets the requirements of, and is in conformity with, the policies of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200)... (Section 30513(c))***

The Coastal Act further provides:

***The local government shall submit to the Commission the zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, and, where necessary, other implementing actions that are required pursuant to this chapter...***

***The Commission may only reject ordinances, zoning district maps, or other implementing action on the grounds that they do not conform with, or are inadequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified land use plan. If the Commission rejects the zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, or other implementing actions, it shall give written notice of the rejection, specifying the provisions of the land use plan with which the rejected zoning ordinances do not conform, or which it finds will not be adequately carried out, together with its reasons for the action taken. (Section 30514)***

The standard of review that the Commission uses in reviewing the adequacy of the land use plan is whether the land use plan is consistent with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. The standard of review for the proposed amendment to the Implementation Plan of the certified Local Coastal Program, pursuant to Section 30513 and 30514 of the Coastal Act, is that the proposed amendment is in conformance with, and adequate to carry out, the provisions of the Land Use Plan (LUP) portion of the certified Santa Barbara County Local Coastal Program. In addition, all Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act have been incorporated in their entirety in the certified County LUP as guiding policies pursuant to Policy 1-1 of the LUP.

### **B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Section 30503 of the Coastal Act requires public input in preparation, approval, certification and amendment of any LCP. The County held a series of public hearings (Planning Commission Hearings 11/8/99, 1/19/00, 3/30/00, 6/7/00, 7/17/00, 8/16/00, 9/18/00, and 10/4/00 and Board of Supervisors Hearings 2/20/01, 3/19/01, 4/24/01, 8/13/01, 11/05/01, 12/03/01 and 2/19/02) and received written comments regarding the project from concerned parties and members of the public. The hearings were noticed to the public consistent with Sections 13552 and 13551 of the California Code of Regulations. Notice of the subject amendment has been distributed to all known interested parties.



## C. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

Pursuant to Section 13551 (b) of the California Code of Regulations, the County resolution for submittal may submit a Local Coastal Program Amendment that will either require formal local government adoption after the Commission approval, or is an amendment that will take effect automatically upon the Commission's approval pursuant to Public Resources Code Sections 30512, 30513, and 30519. In this case, because this approval is subject to suggested modifications by the Commission, if the Commission approves this Amendment, the County must act to accept the certified suggested modifications within six months from the date of Commission action in order for the Amendment to become effective (Section 13544.5; Section 13537 by reference;). Pursuant to Section 13544, the Executive Director shall determine whether the County's action is adequate to satisfy all requirements of the Commission's certification order and report on such adequacy to the Commission. If the Commission denies the LCP Amendment, as submitted, no further action is required by either the Commission or the County.

## II. STAFF RECOMMENDATION, MOTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS ON THE LAND USE PLAN/COASTAL PLAN (LUP/CP)

Following public hearing, staff recommends the Commission adopt the following resolutions and findings. The appropriate motion to introduce the resolution and a staff recommendation is provided just prior to each resolution.

### A. DENIAL AS SUBMITTED

**MOTION I:**        *I move that the Commission CERTIFY Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 to the County of Santa Barbara Land Use Plan (Coastal Plan), as submitted by the County of Santa Barbara.*

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF REJECTION:**

Staff recommends a **NO** vote. Failure of this motion will result in denial of the land use plan as submitted and adoption of the following resolution. The motion to certify as submitted passes only upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed Commissioners.

### **RESOLUTION TO DENY CERTIFICATION OF THE LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED:**

The Commission hereby denies certification of Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 to the County of Santa Barbara Land Use Plan (Coastal Plan) and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the land use plan as submitted does not meet the requirements of and is not in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification

of the land use plan would not meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, as there are feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen the significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the land use plan as submitted.

## **B. CERTIFICATION WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS**

**MOTION II:**      *I move that the Commission CERTIFY Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 to the County of Santa Barbara Land Use Plan (Coastal Plan), if modified as suggested in this staff report.*

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO CERTIFY IF MODIFIED:**

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in certification of the land use plan with suggested modifications and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion to certify with suggested modifications passes only upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed Commissioners.

### **RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS:**

The Commission hereby certifies Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 to the County of Santa Barbara Land Use Plan (Coastal Plan) if modified as suggested and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the land use plan with the suggested modifications will meet the requirements of and be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification of the land use plan if modified as suggested complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the plan on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the land use plan if modified.

## **III. STAFF RECOMMENDATION, MOTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/COASTAL ZONING ORDINANCE (IP/CZO)**

Following public hearing, staff recommends the Commission adopt the following resolutions and findings. The appropriate motion to introduce the resolution and a staff recommendation is provided just prior to each resolution.

## **A. DENIAL AS SUBMITTED**

**MOTION III:**     *I move that the Commission reject the County of Santa Barbara Implementation Program/Coastal Zoning Ordinance Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 as submitted.*

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF REJECTION:**

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in rejection of Implementation Program and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

### **RESOLUTION TO DENY CERTIFICATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED:**

The Commission hereby denies certification of the County of Santa Barbara Implementation Program/Coastal Zoning Ordinance Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Program as submitted does not conform with, and is inadequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan as amended. Certification of the Implementation Program would not meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act as there are feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen the significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the Implementation Program as submitted

## **B. CERTIFICATION WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS**

**MOTION IV:**     *I move that the Commission certify County of Santa Barbara Implementation Program/Coastal Zoning Ordinance Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 if it is modified as suggested in this staff report.*

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in certification of the Implementation Program Amendment with suggested modifications and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

### **RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM AMENDMENT WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS:**

The Commission hereby certifies the County of Santa Barbara Implementation Program/Coastal Zoning Ordinance Amendment STB-MAJ-2-02 if modified as suggested and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Program with the suggested modifications conforms with, and is adequate to carry out,

the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan as amended, if modified as suggested herein. Certification of the Implementation Program if modified as suggested complies with the California Environmental Quality Act, because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the Implementation Program on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts on the environment.

## **IV. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS ON THE LAND USE PLAN/COASTAL PLAN (LUP/CP)**

The staff recommends the Commission certify the following, with the modifications as shown below. The proposed amended language to the certified LUP is shown in straight type. Language recommended by Commission staff to be ~~deleted~~ is shown in line-out. Language proposed by Commission staff to be inserted is shown underlined. Other suggested modifications that do not directly change LCP text (e.g., revisions to maps, figures, instructions) are shown in italics.

### **1. Development Location**

*Add the follow to the end of Section 3.2, Development:*

#### Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Development Policies

Policy 2-24: All greenhouse and greenhouse related development of 20,000 sq. ft. or greater, cumulative per parcel, within the Carpinteria Valley area shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to any existing greenhouse development to preserve the scenic values and rural character of the Carpinteria Valley.

### **2. Lot coverage**

#### ***Policy 8-6***

##### **1. Lot Coverage**

Lot coverage shall be calculated to include all greenhouses, shade and hoop structures, packing and shipping facilities, and greenhouse related development, including accessory buildings, and associated paved and unpaved driveways and parking areas.

a. For parcels identified as view corridor parcels on the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District map, lot coverage shall not exceed 25% net lot coverage. Development shall be clustered adjacent to existing greenhouse development to the greatest extent feasible.

b. In Area B, the maximum cumulative lot coverage shall be 20,000 square feet.

**3. Maximum Slope**

*Add the follow to the end of Section 3.3.4, Hillside and Watershed Protection:*

Policy 3-23: In order to protect scenic resources, water quality, and community character, and reduce landform alteration, greenhouses and greenhouse related development shall be prohibited on slopes in excess of 10 percent within Area B of the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. Greenhouse or greenhouse related development may be approved on slopes between 5 and 10 percent, subject to a Conditional Use Permit.

**4. Prime Agricultural Soils**

*Add the follow to the end of Section 3.8, Agriculture:*

Policy 8-11: The following requirements shall apply to greenhouse and greenhouse related development within the Carpinteria Valley to protect the long-term productivity of prime agricultural soils:

- a. Greenhouse operations on prime agricultural soils shall encourage use of in-soil cultivation methods.
- b. Prime agricultural soils shall not be modified with sterilants or other chemicals that would adversely affect the long-term productivity of the soil.
- c. The removal of prime agricultural soils shall be prohibited, including removal of indigenous prime soils used as a growing medium for container plants which are sold intact.

**5. Subdivision Intensification**

*Add the follow to the end of Section 3.8, Agriculture:*

Policy 8-12: No increase in greenhouses or greenhouse related development within the Carpinteria Valley shall result from divisions or redivisions of land, redesignations or rezonings of AG-I or AG-II, or other land uses, subsequent to the date of Commission action on LCP amendment STB-MAJ-2-02.

**6. Alternative Transportation**

***Policy 8-5(I)***

When the County adopts a Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for the Montecito-Summerland-Carpinteria and Toro Canyon Plan areas, it shall include areas of Carpinteria Valley where appropriate. The TIP shall address any necessary long-term improvements to roadways and alternative transportation facilities, including any appropriate traffic calming measures, designed to maintain public

safety and acceptable levels of service on roadways and intersections on an area-wide basis. The TIP shall include a bicycle route improvement plan that will address conflicts with greenhouse related truck traffic trips. The TIP shall be an integrated plan for capital improvements of roads and intersections as well as alternative transportation facilities.

The TIP shall include a comprehensive traffic management program to address problems related to increased vehicular and truck traffic traveling through residential areas. The County Public Works and Planning and Development Departments shall work cooperatively with the City of Carpinteria and the Santa Barbara Flower Growers Association to identify appropriate neighborhood traffic solutions, which may include identification of appropriate truck routes which provide access to greenhouse development while minimizing travel through residential neighborhoods.

Identified improvements shall be funded through collection of traffic mitigation fees and/or grants, and implemented through the TIP. The TIP shall contain a list of transportation projects to be undertaken and include projected costs for each funded and unfunded improvement. The County shall also revise the Transportation Impact Fee based upon the projected cost of transportation system improvements identified in the TIP.

## **7. Conditional Use Permit**

***The following modifications shall be added to the text on page 106, under Section 3.8.2 Planning Issues, Impact of Greenhouse Development on Coastal Resources:***

The industrial appearance of greenhouses as viewed from Highway 101 and other public streets in the Valley can detract from the visual quality of the coastal area if not appropriately landscaped. The County has instituted landscaping requirements which have been effective in most cases in minimizing the visual impact of greenhouses. According to the requirements in A-I-X zone, a landscaping plan must be approved by the County Planning and Development Resource Management Department and such landscaping must be capable of screening greenhouse structures and parking areas within five years. These measures ~~are~~ may be adequate to protect coastal visual resources. However, in rural areas, such as open field agricultural, ranch lands and open space, visual impacts may not be adequately mitigated through landscaping.

***Policy 8-5 shall be modified:***

All greenhouse projects of 20,000 or more square feet and all additions to existing greenhouse development, i.e., greenhouse expansion, packing sheds, or other development for a total of existing and additions of 20,000 or more square feet,

shall be subject to County discretionary approval and, therefore, subject to environmental review under County CEQA guidelines.

Prior to issuance of a coastal development permit, the County shall make the findings based on information provided by environmental documents, staff analysis, and the applicant that all significant adverse impacts of the development as addressed in paragraphs “a” through “e” below have been identified and mitigated.

Except for greenhouse development subject to the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District, all greenhouses and greenhouse related development (e.g., packing sheds, driveways, parking, etc.), including all additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development, that result in a total of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, shall require a Major CUP in any agriculturally designated zone district. A Major CUP shall also be required for greenhouse development of any size where greenhouse or greenhouse related development is proposed on slopes greater than five percent. A CUP shall only be approved when findings are made consistent with the requirements in Sec. 35-68.12 and Sec. 35-69.9 of the Zoning Code.

## **V. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN/COASTAL ZONING ORDINANCE (IP/CZO)**

The staff recommends the Commission certify the following, with the modifications as shown below. The proposed amended language to the certified LCP Implementation Plan is shown in straight type. Language recommended by Commission staff to be ~~deleted~~ is shown in line-out. Language proposed by Commission staff to be inserted is shown underlined. Other suggested modifications that do not directly change LCP text (e.g., revisions to maps, figures, instructions) are shown in italics.

### **8. Area Boundaries**

*Carpinteria Agricultural District Overlay Map*

*The Carpinteria Agricultural District Overlay Map shall be modified to illustrate that all AG-I parcels that are not identified as Area A shall be designated as Area B.*

### **9. Processing**

**Sec. 35-102E.5.        *Processing.***

2. The following types of development shall require a Development Plan (Sec. 35-174) and a Coastal Development Permit (Sec. 35-169):

- a. In Area A, development of new greenhouses, greenhouse related development, packing and shipping facilities, additions or alterations to

existing greenhouses or greenhouse related development, and conversions of shade or hoop structures to greenhouses or greenhouse related development, where the cumulative lot coverage would total 20,000 square feet or more (see Section 35-102E.5.3 for additional requirements for packing and shipping facilities).

4. Greenhouse and greenhouse related development on 5 to 10% slopes shall require a Major Conditional Use Permit. Prior to approval of such development, the approving body shall make findings described in Sec. 35-68.12 and Sec. 35-69.9.

## **10. Submittal Requirements**

### **Sec. 35-102E.6.        *Submittal Requirements***

1. In addition to the application requirements of Sec. 35-169, applications for a coastal development permit for any greenhouse, greenhouse related development, packing and shipping facilities, and/or shade or hoop structure in the CA Overlay District shall include:

a. A complete listing of the types, ~~and quantities~~ and frequencies of application of chemicals (fertilizers, salts, corrosion inhibitors, etc.) that are expected to be used in the greenhouse operation.

...

e. Determination of the extent and location of prime agricultural soils (pursuant to the definition of prime agricultural lands in Section 35-58 of the Zoning Code) in the project area.

...

i. A water quality management plan, required for all greenhouses, greenhouse related development, and hoop structures, to consist of the components listed in Sec. 35-102E.9.

2. In addition to the application requirements in item 1 above and Sec. 35-174 (Development Plans), applications for a development plan or conditional use permit for any greenhouse, greenhouse related development, and/or hoop structure in the CA Overlay District shall include the items below. These items may not be required for a new shade structure with no other greenhouse development on site.

~~a. A water quality management plan to consist of the components listed in Sec. 35-102E.9.~~

a. ~~b.~~ A Traffic Management Plan to consist of the components listed in Sec. 35-102E.9.

## **11. Lot Coverage**

### **Sec. 35-102E.8.        *General Requirements***



1. Lot Coverage

Lot coverage shall include all greenhouses, shade and hoop structures, packing and shipping facilities, and greenhouse related development, including accessory buildings, and associated paved driveways and parking areas.

- a. For parcels identified as view corridor parcels on the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District map, lot coverage shall not exceed 25% net lot coverage. Development shall be clustered adjacent to existing greenhouse development to the greatest extent feasible.
- b. In Area B, the maximum cumulative lot coverage shall be 20,000 square feet.

12. **Maximum Slope**

**Sec. 35-102E.8. General Requirements**

**4. Maximum Slope**

a. In Area B, greenhouses and greenhouse related development shall be prohibited on slopes in excess of 10 percent within the Carpinteria Valley. Greenhouse and greenhouse related development on 5 to 10% slopes shall require a Major Conditional Use Permit. Prior to approval of such development, the approving body shall make findings described in Sec. 35-68.12 and Sec. 35-69.9.

13. **Prime Agricultural Soils**

**Sec. 35-102E.8. General Requirements**

**5. Prime Agricultural Soils**

- a. Greenhouse operations on prime agricultural soils shall encourage use of in-soil cultivation methods.
- b. Prime agricultural soils shall not be modified with sterilants or other chemicals that would adversely affect the long-term productivity of the soil.
- c. The removal of prime agricultural soils shall be prohibited, including removal of indigenous prime soils used as a growing medium for container plants which are sold intact.

14. **Subdivision Intensification**

*Add new* **Sec. 35-102E.10. Subdivisions**

No increase in greenhouses or greenhouse related development within the Carpinteria Valley shall result from divisions or redivisions of land, redesignations or

rezonings of AG-I or AG-II, or other land uses, subsequent to the date of Commission action on LCP amendment STB-MAJ-2-02.

**15. Development Standards Landscaping**

***Sec. 35-102E.9. Development Standards for Greenhouses and Related Development.***

A. Prior to approval of a coastal development permit for any greenhouse, related development, packing and shipping facility, shade or hoop structure, within the CA Overlay District, the proposed development shall meet the following development standards where applicable.

1. A landscaping plan shall be required which provides, to the maximum extent feasible, visual screening of all structures and parking areas from all adjacent public roads and view corridors. The landscape plan shall include the following:

...

b. Landscaping within front setbacks shall gradually increase in height away from public roadways. Solid wall fencing shall not be relied upon as a primary means of screening. Solid wall or dark chain-link security fencing shall be screened from public view corridors by dense landscaping and/or covered with attractive climbing vines.

...

d. Landscaping, fences, and walls shall not impede views of scenic areas from public roads, parks, beaches, or other public viewing areas.

**16. Visual Resources**

***The following shall be added to the end of Subsection A of Sec. 35-102E.9. Development Standards for Greenhouses and Related Development.***

18. Greenhouse development shall be sited and designed to minimize adverse impacts on scenic areas, and public views of the ridgelines and natural features visible from public roadways or other public viewing areas to the maximum extent feasible. If there is no feasible building site location on the proposed project site where development would not be visible, then the development shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts on scenic areas and public views of ridgeline and natural features visible from scenic highways or public viewing areas, through measures including, but not limited to, siting development in the least visible portion of the site, reducing maximum height standards, breaking up the mass of new structures, clustering new structures with existing greenhouse development along the edges of the properties to maintain maximum through-view corridor, and incorporating landscape elements.

19. Avoidance of impacts to visual resources through site selection and design alternatives is the preferred method over landscape screening. Landscape screening, as mitigation of visual impacts shall not substitute for project alternatives including re-siting, or reducing the height or bulk of the greenhouse development.

*Update Numbering Sequence for Subsection A and Subsection B.*

## **17. Development Standards Water Quality**

### ***Sec. 35-102E.9. Development Standards for Greenhouses and Related Development.***

~~2. Unless otherwise exempted by the Flood Control District, a~~All new greenhouses, development and greenhouse related development, packing and shipping facilities and hoop structures shall be required to mitigate for increased storm water runoff from development of the project site. Post-development peak runoff rate shall not exceed 75% of the calculated pre-development peak runoff rate for 5-100 year events. Where required, retention basins and other storm water drainage facilities shall be designed in conformance with the County Flood Control District and County Water Agency<sup>1</sup> standards and guidelines.

3. Where wastewater flows from ~~new greenhouses, development~~ greenhouse related development, hoop structures and packing and shipping facilities are proposed to be disposed through ~~a~~ private septic system, adequate undeveloped area shall be maintained to accommodate the septic system components, including 100% expansion areas, and required setbacks from buildings, property lines, wells, storm water retention facilities, streams, etc. No development shall be placed above the septic system components.

4. Compost, fertilizer and pesticides shall be stored in a manner that minimizes generation of leachate ~~and polluted runoff~~. The storage area must have a covering to minimize the exposure of these materials to stormwater. In addition, Leachate controls include covering compost piles and fertilizer storage with a roof and areas shall be locating located storage areas outside of the 100-year flood plain. ~~Uncovered storage areas shall be located at least 250 feet from a waterway (i.e., storm drain, creek, salt marsh or ocean) unless it can be demonstrated that no adverse effect on water quality will result. Should any discharge occur that could impair the water quality of the receiving body, then a discharge permit will be required from the Regional Water Quality Control Board.~~

5. The Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District shall review and approve storage areas for pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers. Storage areas shall be

---

<sup>1</sup> In cases where the County Water Agency (CWA) does not maintain authority over the regulation of greenhouse development, policy references to the CWA denote that greenhouse development must be consistent with the water quality design *standards* adopted by the County Water Agency.

designed with the following mandatory components, and or other requirements deemed necessary by the District:

- a. A low berm shall be designated around the interior floor to prevent migration of materials in the event of a spill. Any spilled material shall be disposed of in accordance with Carpinteria-Summerland Fire Protection District requirements.
- b. The floor shall be a concrete slab.
- c. The storage area must have a covering.
- d. The berm shall be designed to provide 100% containment of any stored liquids in the event of a spill.
- e. In the event that storage, handling or use of hazardous materials within the provisions of AB 2185/2187 occurs on site, the applicant shall implement a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP).

~~6. High saline brines shall not be discharged to the storm drain or allowed to percolate into the groundwater unless it can be demonstrated that no adverse effect on water quality will result. Waste brine shall be contained and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, county and local regulations and requirements. Should any discharge occur that could impair the water quality of the receiving body.~~  
If any discharge of high saline brines is proposed, then the discharger shall consult with a discharge permit will be required from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) staff to determine the appropriate regulatory requirements for the specific discharge.

9. To the maximum extent feasible, hardscaped areas (i.e., parking lots, driveways, loading bays, interior walkways in greenhouses, packing and shipping facilities, and accessory building footprints) shall be minimized in order to preserve the maximum amount of agricultural soils and reduce the potential for adverse impacts to water quality.

***The following shall be added to the end of Subsection A of Sec. 35-102E.9. Development Standards for Greenhouses and Related Development.***

20. Greenhouses, greenhouse related development, and hoop structures shall be required to implement post-construction structural treatment control Best Management Practices (BMPs) if determined necessary for the protection of water quality by the County on a case-by-case basis. Where required, these post-construction structural treatment control BMPs shall be designed and installed consistent with County Flood Control District and County Water Agency standards and guidelines, including accommodating rainfall events up to 1.2 inches in volume or 0.3 inches per hour. These post-construction structural treatment control BMPs can be stand-alone devices or integrated into the storm water drainage facilities used to control the 5-100 year events as described in Sec. 35-102E.9.2.

***The following shall be moved from Subsection B of Sec. 35-102E.9. to the end of Subsection A of Sec. 35-102E.9. Development Standards for Greenhouses and Related Development.***

2021. Applicants shall prepare a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for review and approval by Planning and Development and consultation by Environmental Health Services, the Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Carpinteria Valley Water District. ~~The Water Quality Management Plan~~ WQMP shall be required for all greenhouses, greenhouse related development, and hoop structures and shall consist of the following components:

- a. An erosion and sediment control plan, including a description of BMPs that will be implemented during the construction phase of development to prevent water quality degradation.
- b. The location, description and design of all post-construction BMPs.
- c. A flow diagram of the proposed water system to be used, including average and maximum daily flows.
- d. The mapped location of all existing and proposed surface and sub-surface drainage facilities.
- e. Information on the proposed water and nutrient delivery systems, specifying water conservation measures and a comprehensive nutrient management plan designed to minimize nutrient loss.
- f. Pesticide Best Management Practices that minimize the use of pesticides as defined and required by the County Agricultural Commissioner.
- g. The location and type of treatment and disposal facilities for irrigation, washwater, boiler blowdown, water softener regeneration brines, and retention basins.
- h. Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to eliminate or minimize polluted runoff, including but not limited to the following:
  - i) Use of water systems that minimize surface water transport (i.e., trickle, drip, mist, hydroponic irrigation systems).
  - iii) Use of water and nutrient recycling technologies.
  - iv) Use of soil conservation techniques that reduce erosion and sedimentation and remove solids and associated pollutants in runoff.
  - v) Employment of fertilization methods that maximize the efficiency of nutrient delivery and uptake such as controlled-release fertilizers (CRF) or liquid fertilizer (LF).
  - vi) Implementation of Integrated Pest Management techniques.

All greenhouses, greenhouse related development, and hoop structures should implement measures to eliminate the need for discharge of wastewater (i.e.

irrigation runoff). Should any discharge occur that could impair the water quality of the receiving body, if any type of discharge to land, groundwater, or surface water of wastewater is proposed, then the discharger shall submit a Report of Waste Discharge to a discharge permit will be required from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) staff. The Water Quality Management Plan shall indicate any discharge requirements determined necessary by the RWQCB.

The approved Water Quality Management Plan shall be implemented by the applicant for the proposed greenhouse development and greenhouse related development.

2422. Irrigation Water Detention System: If deemed necessary by Planning and Development, in consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board staff, to further reduce potential water quality impacts, all excess surface irrigation process water shall be collected and routed to a sealed bottom, irrigation water detention basin. The detention basin shall function as a water bank during low rainfall periods (i.e. May to November) for water conservation and reuse. The irrigation water detention basin shall be separate from and not connected to any required flood control retention basin. The irrigation water detention basin shall be designed in accordance with Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District and County Water Agency requirements.

2223. Applicants shall reimburse tThe Carpinteria Valley Water District (CVWD) shall determine, pursuant to adopted criteria, the necessary groundwater testing and reporting required to monitor nitrate loading of groundwater caused by the applicant's development, for costs related to additional groundwater testing and reporting as deemed necessary by CVWD, pursuant to adopted criteria, to monitor nitrate loading of groundwater caused by applicant's development. The applicant shall install any monitoring wells as required by CVWD, or shall reimburse CVWD for the cost of installation of these wells. The applicant shall conduct groundwater testing and reporting as required by CVWD, or shall reimburse CVWD for the cost of this testing and reporting. Said costs may also include those caused by the installation of monitoring wells deemed necessary by CVWD. All monitoring data and reports prepared by CVWD shall be submitted as public record to the CVWD Board of Directors and the County Planning & Development Department. Nitrate loading found to be in excess of District standards, as a result of the groundwater testing conducted or required by CVWD, shall cause a subsequent review of the greenhouse facility and operations by CVWD, in consultation with Planning & Development. All subsequent review costs shall be paid for by the applicant. If District standards continue to be exceeded, the applicant must implement a plan, approved by CVWD and the County, to modify its operations to address the nitrate loading. In addition, CVWD may take enforcement action, as applicable. Compliance with the requirements of this paragraph shall be imposed as a condition of approval of the CDP.

*Update numbering sequence for Subsection A and Subsection B.*

**18. Development Standards for Residential Setbacks**

***Sec. 35-102E.9. Development Standards for Greenhouses and Related Development***

15. To the maximum extent feasible, packing and distribution facilities, loading docks, and delivery bays shall be centrally located within individual greenhouse operations. When packing and distribution facilities are centrally located, the driveway to reach such a facility shall not be counted toward the CA Overlay development cap. Idling of trucks shall be prohibited between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. A minimum 100-foot setback shall be maintained between loading/unloading areas, driveways and parking areas and adjacent residential properties ~~unless it can be determined that shielding or other measures can provide sufficient attenuation to reduce noise at the property line to less than 65 dB(A) CNEL.~~

**19. Abandonment**

***The following shall be added to the end of Subsection A of Sec. 35-102E.9. Development Standards for Greenhouses and Related Development***

24. Prior to approval of any project, the property owner must sign a written agreement with Santa Barbara County to remove greenhouse or greenhouse related development, or any portion thereof, if any component of the greenhouse development is abandoned (not in operation for 24 consecutive months). If, after 24 months of non-use for greenhouse purposes, greenhouse activities resume, such activities shall be continued without interruption for longer than 90 days within the subsequent 1 year period, or the facility shall be deemed abandoned and notice of such abandonment shall be served upon the landowner by the County. The property owner shall submit an application for demolition of the applicable development and restoration of agricultural lands suitable to ensure continued agricultural productivity. The removal shall occur within 180 days of issuance of a coastal development permit for removal. Conversion of greenhouse development to non-agricultural uses shall not be considered in lieu of demolition and removal.

*Update the Number Sequence for Subsection A and B of Section 35-102E.9 correspondingly.*

**20. Conditional Use Permit**

***Modify AG-I Zone District, Sec. 35-68.3 Permitted Uses***

5. Greenhouses, hothouses, other plant protection structures, and related development, i.e., packing shed, parking, driveways, etc.; ~~however, for any development of 20,000 square feet or more and all additions which when added to existing development total less than 20,000 square feet on slopes five percent or less or more, a development plan shall be submitted, processed, and approved as~~

~~provided in Section 35-174 (Development Plans).~~ For any greenhouse or related development, packing and shipping facility, and shade and hoop structure in the Carpinteria Valley additional regulations of the Carpinteria Agricultural (CA) Overlay District (Sec. 35-102E) shall apply.

***Add to Section 35-68.4 Uses Permitted with a Major Conditional Use Permit***

5. Greenhouses and greenhouse related development (e.g., packing shed, parking, driveways, etc.) including all additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development that results in a total of 20,000 square feet or more of cumulative development per parcel, and which are not included in the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. No exception to this requirement, such as that stated under subsection (3) above, shall apply.

6. Greenhouses and greenhouse related development of any size on slopes in excess of five percent. No exception to this requirement, such as that stated under subsection (3) above, shall apply.

***Add new Sec. 35-68.12***

Sec. 35-68.12. Findings for Major Conditional Use Permit for Greenhouse Development

No greenhouse or greenhouse related development, including additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development, that results in a total of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, or of lesser size on slopes in excess of five percent, shall be approved unless the decision-maker makes the following findings, in addition to the findings required pursuant to Section 35-172.8 (Conditional Use Permits):

1. That the project is not proposed on a slope greater than 10 percent.
2. That the project meets the development standards for water quality as described in Sec. 35-102E.9(A)(2), (3), (4), (6), (9), (10), (20), (21) and (22).
3. That the project will not require the extension of water and sewage disposal mainlines.
4. That the project will not adversely affect public coastal views, alter the character of rural open space and open field agricultural and grazing areas, or contribute light pollution to night skies in rural areas.
5. That the conversion of foraging habitat to structural development is fully mitigated.
6. That the project will not adversely affect coastal access and recreation through increased traffic conflicts.
7. That development is located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to existing greenhouse development to preserve scenic value and rural character.

***Modify AG-II Zone District, Sec. 35-69.3 Permitted Uses***



7. Greenhouses, hothouses, other plant protection structures, and related development, i.e., packing shed, parking, driveways, etc.; ~~however, for any development of 20,000 square feet or more and all additions which when added to existing development total less than 20,000 square feet on slopes five percent or less or more, a development plan shall be submitted, processed, and approved as provided in Section 35-174 (Development Plans).~~

***Add to Section 35-69.4 Uses Permitted with a Major Conditional Use Permit***

10. Greenhouses and greenhouse related development (e.g., packing shed, parking, driveways, etc.) including all additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development that results in a total of 20,000 square feet or more of cumulative development per parcel.

11. Greenhouses and greenhouse related development of any size on slopes in excess of five percent.

***Add new Sec. 35-69.9***

Sec. 35-69.9. Findings for Major Conditional Use Permit for Greenhouse Development

No greenhouse or greenhouse related development, including additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development, that results in a total of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, or of lesser size on slopes in excess of five percent, shall be approved unless the decision-maker makes the following findings, in addition to the findings required pursuant to Section 35-172.8 (Conditional Use Permits):

1. That the project is not proposed on a slope greater than 10 percent.
2. That the project meets the development standards for water quality as described in Sec. 35-102E.9(A)(2), (3), (4), (6), (9), (10), (20), (21) and (22).
3. That the project will not require the extension of water and sewage disposal mainlines.
4. That the project will not adversely affect public coastal views, alter the character of rural open space and open field agricultural and grazing areas, or contribute light pollution to night skies in rural areas.
5. That the conversion of foraging habitat to structural development is fully mitigated.
6. That the project will not adversely affect coastal access and recreation through increased traffic conflicts.
7. That development is located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to existing greenhouse development to preserve scenic value and rural character.

## **VI. FINDINGS FOR DENIAL AS SUBMITTED AND APPROVAL OF THE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM IF MODIFIED AS SUGGESTED**

The following findings support the Commission's denial of the LCP amendment as submitted, and approval of the LCP amendment if modified as indicated in Section IV and V (*Suggested Modifications*) above. The Commission hereby finds and declares as follows:

### **A. AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION**

Santa Barbara County is requesting an amendment to the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan portions of its certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) to modify greenhouse policies and add an overlay district to all agricultural parcels zoned AG-I within the unincorporated areas of the coastal zone of the Carpinteria Valley (Exhibit 10 and 11) to regulate greenhouses and greenhouse related development, which includes packing and shipping facilities, and shade and hoop structures.

The overlay district is applied differently in Area "A" and Area "B" of the overlay district. Area "A" of the Carpinteria Agricultural (CA) Overlay District encompasses 88 parcels (approximately 664 acres) of AG-I zoned land located south of Highway 192, east of Nidever Road and west of Linden Avenue (Exhibit 12). Area A allows for future expansion of greenhouses and greenhouse related development with a development cap of 2.75 million sq. ft. (63 acres) for all greenhouses and greenhouse-related development, with the exception of shade structures. Without the cap, approximately 8.6 million sq. ft. of additional greenhouse development could occur in Area A based solely on the ability to build out to the applied setback allowances and the 25% maximum lot coverage for view corridor parcels. A total of 14.9 million square feet of greenhouse and greenhouse related development on approximately 750 acres is estimated to be present within the Carpinteria Valley. The County estimates that approximately 9.1 million sq. ft. of that amount is located south of State Highway 192 between Nidever Road and Linden Avenue (Area A). Under this amendment, 2.75 million sq. ft. of additional greenhouse and greenhouse related development is proposed over the 664 acres comprising Area A. The revised Final EIR (February 2002) states "Area A provides a logical greenhouse expansion boundary for the continuation of highly productive coastal agriculture opportunities, while preserving the scenic values and rural character of the Carpinteria Valley."

Area B of the CA Overlay District is comprised of all remaining parcels not covered by Area A in the Overlay District, encompassing approximately 4,972 acres of AG-I zoned land (Exhibit 12). Area B limits new greenhouses, greenhouse related development, packing and shipping facilities, shade structures, and hoop structures to *less than 20,000 sq. ft.* of cumulative development per lot.

The County proposes to:

1. Amend the Land Use Plan portion of its LCP: (a) *LUP Policy 8-5* (regarding the identification and mitigation of all significant adverse impacts as a result of greenhouse projects of 20,000 or more square feet); (b) Amend *LUP Policy 8-6* (regarding setback and maximum lot coverage requirements); and (c) Insert additional descriptive text to *Section 4.2.2* describing greenhouse development. (See Exhibit 1)
2. Amend Section 35-58, *Definitions*, of the Zoning Code to define *Greenhouse*, *Greenhouse Related Development*, *Shade Structure*, and *Hoop Structure*. (See Exhibit 2)
3. Amend Section 35-68, *AG-I Agriculture I*, of the Zoning Code to apply additional regulations to any greenhouse or related development in the Carpinteria Valley pursuant to the Carpinteria Agricultural (CA) Overlay District. (See Exhibit 2)
4. Add Section 35-102E, *CA Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District*, to the Zoning Code. Section 35-102E establishes (a) the purpose and intent of the CA overlay district; (b) the effect on non-conforming uses; (c) the development cap for greenhouse and greenhouse related development; (d) the processing requirements; (e) submittal requirements; (f) general standards; and (g) specific greenhouse and related development standards. (See Exhibit 2)
5. Amend Section 35-162, *Nonconforming Buildings and Structures*, of the Zoning Code to allow greenhouses, packing and shipping facilities, shade and hoop structures, and greenhouse related development in the CA Overlay District that is damaged by natural disaster, to an extent of 75% or more of the replacement cost at the time of damage, to be reconstructed in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 35-102E thereby becoming conforming structures. (See Exhibit 2)
6. Amend the Zoning Map to add the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. (See Exhibit 3)

## **1. LUP Amendment**

The County proposes to amend Policy 8-5(e) to reference the new Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District (see Exhibit 1, page 3). The amendment also includes the addition of subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l) to Policy 8-5 (see Exhibit 1, pages 4-6). Policy 8-5(f) requires the County to complete an updated assessment of the effects of the existing greenhouse development on coastal resources, including assessment of surface and groundwater quality, visual resources, prime agricultural soils, and biological studies, prior to processing any amendment to the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District or the proposed development cap. The assessment shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of the County's greenhouse permit process. Policy 8-5(f) also requires the updated assessment to be reviewed by Citizens Advisory Committee and for that Committee to provide recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Policy 8-5(g) addresses identification of appropriate sites for farm employee housing. Policy 8-5(h) requires the establishment of a Watershed Management Program to protect surface water quality and the ecological functions of

the Carpinteria Salt Marsh. Policy 8-5(i) requires the County to coordinate with the Environmental Protection Agency and Regional Water Quality Control Board to establish Total Maximum Daily Loads for nitrates entering Carpinteria Salt Marsh and Carpinteria Creek. Policy 8-5(j) requires contributions towards future interchange improvements where new greenhouse development contributes to peak hour trips at the Santa Monica/Via Real/U.S. 101 northbound ramp interchange or the Linden Avenue/U.S. 101 south bound ramp interchange. Policy 8-5(k) allows for additional investigation and corrective action at two intersections identified as experiencing elevated collision rates, Route 192/Cravens Lane and Route 192/Linden Avenue. Policy 8-5(k) further requires the relocation of a utility pole at Route 192/Casitas Pass Road intersection. Policy 8-5(l) outlines issues related to greenhouses in Carpinteria Valley that must be addressed during the adoption of a Transportation Improvement Plan for the Montecito-Summerland-Carpinteria and Toro Canyon Plan area. The County also proposes to amend Policy 8-6 to specify the lot coverage, height, and setback requirements for greenhouse development within the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District.

## **2. IP/CZO Amendment**

The County proposes to insert the following definitions into Section 35-58 of the County Zoning Ordinance:

**GREENHOUSE**: A structure with permanent structural elements (e.g., footings, foundations, plumbing, electrical wiring, etc.) used for cultivation and to shade or protect plants from climatic variations. Any hothouse or plant protection structure that does not fall within the definition of shade structure or hoop structure shall be included in the definition of greenhouse.

**GREENHOUSE RELATED DEVELOPMENT**: Permanent development associated with and accessory to greenhouses, shade structures and hoop structures. Such development includes packing and shipping facilities, paved parking and driveways, and associated accessory structures (e.g., boiler rooms, storage sheds, etc.).

**SHADE STRUCTURE**: A structure consisting of a frame with no permanent structural elements (e.g., footings, foundations, plumbing, electrical wiring, etc.) and a dark, permeable, removable covering (e.g., netting) used to shade plants grown in the soil or in containers upon the soil.

**HOOP STRUCTURE**: A structures consisting of a light-weight, arched frame with no permanent structural elements (e.g. footings, foundations, plumbing, electrical wiring, etc.) and an impermeable, removable covering used to protect plants grown in the soil or in containers upon the soil. Includes structures commonly known as berry hoops and hoop houses.

The proposed Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District is differentiated into two areas, Area “A” allows for intensive greenhouse development and Area “B,” comprised of the remaining agricultural areas, limits cumulative lot coverage of greenhouse development

to 20,000 square feet. The proposed overlay district applies greenhouse development requirements with regard to setbacks, height, and lot coverage (see Table 1, below). In addition, the overlay district applies development standards related to water quality, landscaping, lighting and glare, air quality, noise, prime soils, hazards, and traffic.

**Table 1. Proposed Greenhouse Requirements for Lot Coverage, Height, and Setbacks.**

<b>Lot Coverage</b>	<b>Height</b>	<b>Setbacks</b>
<p>Lot coverage shall include all greenhouses, shade and hoop structures, and greenhouse related development, including accessory buildings, packing and shipping facilities, and associated paved driveways and parking areas.</p> <p>For parcels identified as view corridor parcels on the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District map, lot coverage shall not exceed 25% net lot coverage. Development shall be clustered adjacent to existing greenhouse development to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>The maximum absolute height of any greenhouse or greenhouse related development, including packing and shipping facilities, shall be no greater than thirty (30) feet above finished grade. The maximum absolute height of any shade structure or hoop structure shall be no greater than twelve (12) feet above natural grade.</p> <p>Within view corridors the maximum absolute height of any greenhouse or greenhouse related development, including packing and shipping facilities, shall be no greater than twenty-five (25) feet above finished grade.</p>	<p>The following setbacks for greenhouses and related structures shall apply:</p> <p>a. <i>Front</i>: Seventy-five (75) feet from the right of way line of any street. For parcels within identified view corridors, the front setback shall be at least two hundred fifty (250) feet from right of way.</p> <p>b. <i>Side and Rear</i>: Thirty (30) feet from the lot lines on which the building or structure is located.</p> <p>c. <i>Interior Lot</i>: Twenty (20) feet from the lot lines on which the building or structure is located.</p> <p>d. One hundred (100) feet from a residentially zoned lot or fifty (50) feet from an adjacent parcel where there is an approved residential dwelling located within fifty (50) feet of the parcel boundary.</p> <p>e. One hundred (100) feet from top-of-bank or edge of riparian habitat of natural creek channels, whichever is greater.</p>

The overlay district defines which greenhouse development projects require a Coastal Development Permit (ministerial under the certified LCP) and which projects require a Coastal Development Permit and a Development Plan (requiring discretionary review by the County). There are special requirements for packing and shipping facilities. These are discussed detail below.

Projects that require a CDP include:

- (1) greenhouse and greenhouse related development with cumulative lot coverage of less than 20,000 sq. ft.
- (2) shade or hoop structures with cumulative lot (cumulative lot coverage includes all greenhouse related development) coverage of less than 20,000 sq. ft.; and
- (3) minor alterations or additions to existing greenhouse or related development, including retrofit of aging structures if structures are:
  - (a) legally permitted;

- (b) do not conflict with project condition of approval for existing structure;
- (c) alterations do not reduce effectiveness of landscaping screening, result in the removal of specimen trees, or disrupt ESH;
- (d) if alterations incorporate all development standards required under the proposed overlay; and
- (e) if additions do not result in a cumulative lot coverage of 20,000 sq. ft. or more, or an increase of 1,000 sq. ft. or 5% or building coverage of all existing structures, whichever is less.

Projects that require a Development Plan and a CDP include: (1) In Area “A,” all new greenhouse and greenhouse related development, additions or alterations to existing greenhouse and greenhouse related development, conversion of shade or hoop structures to greenhouses, where the cumulative lot coverage would total 20,000 sq. ft. or more and (2) In Area “A” development of new shade structures or hoop structures where the cumulative lot coverage would total 20,000 sq. ft. or more.

Packing and shipping facilities, other than the following shall require a Minor Conditional Use Permit. Packing and shipping facilities of less than 5,000 sq. ft. may be processed by a CDP only, provided there are no existing greenhouses or greenhouse related development on the lot.

The proposed CA Overlay also includes provisions to allow existing legally permitted, nonconforming greenhouse development to continue in perpetuity with minor alterations and additions, including retrofit of aging structures. The structures would be encouraged over time to comply with the height and setback requirements, and all applicable development standards of the overlay district. The CA Overlay District requirements provide special consideration for existing greenhouses that are in excess of the 20,000 sq. ft. per parcel cumulative development limit in Area B. The amendment proposes to grandfather the *size* (cumulative lot coverage) of all legally permitted greenhouse development in Area B. Greenhouse development of greater than 20,000 sq. ft. in Area B, which meets all other provisions of the CA Overlay District is considered a conforming structure. Greenhouse development of greater than 20,000 sq. ft. in Area B which does *not* meet the other provisions of the CA Overlay District is considered a nonconforming structure and the property owner would be permitted to: remodel and/or rebuild the development at the same size in the same general location consistent with the provision of the proposed overlay district; construct minor additions up to a maximum of 1,000 sq. ft.; and rebuild the same size facility in the same general location to meet CA Overlay District requirements if the structure was destroyed (damaged at 75% or more of the replacement cost) by natural disaster.

The proposed amendment includes special provisions for nonconforming structures that are damaged by fire, flood, earthquake or other natural disaster. According to the certified language in the LCP, if the damage is less than 75% of the replacement cost at the time of damage, non-conforming structures may be restored to the same or lesser size in the same general footprint location. Under this amendment, if the damage is

more than 75% of the replacement cost at the time of damage, the structure may be reconstructed in accordance with the overlay district requirements, thereby becoming a conforming structure.

The CA Overlay also includes an amnesty program allowing existing unpermitted greenhouse development constructed prior to April 22, 1999 (the date of the Notice of Preparation for the Environmental Impact Report for this project) to be legalized through application for a development permit if such structures conform to the provisions of the overlay district. There is one exception, however, for structures over 20,000 sq. ft. in Area B. These larger developments will be allowed to be same or lesser size providing they meet all other provisions of the overlay district. Under the County's proposal, structures legalized during the two-year amnesty would not be counted towards the development cap.

## **B. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE**

The Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Study Area encompasses the majority of the Carpinteria Valley and contains approximately 7,196 acres or 11.2 square miles (see Exhibit 11). The study area is bounded by the Summerland Community Plan boundary to the west, Ventura County to the east (i.e., Rincon Creek), the coastal zone boundary to the north (roughly the 1,000-foot elevation contour) and U.S. Highway 101 to the south. The study area includes the Carpinteria Salt Marsh but excludes the City of Carpinteria with the southern boundary of the study area surrounding the City of Carpinteria. The interface of the City and the study area consists primarily of residential subdivisions, although some commercial/industrial uses also exist in the eastern end of the Valley.

The Carpinteria greenhouse industry has grown rapidly since first introduced in 1962. Starting with approximately 100,000 square feet of greenhouses and related development, greenhouse use grew to three million square feet by 1970, eight million square feet by 1982, and the current 14.9 million square feet in 1999. The majority of greenhouse development has occurred in the western portion of the study area, south of Highway 192, east of Nidever Road, and west of Linden Avenue. In this area, approximately 9.1 million square feet (209 acres) of greenhouses and related facilities have been developed, which is approximately 60% of the total greenhouse development in the study area.

The demand for new greenhouse space has resulted primarily from the ability of growers to control growing conditions within the structures. Within modern greenhouses, water and fertilizer use, pest control measures, humidity levels, and light exposure can be carefully controlled. This allows growers to produce hard-to-grow plant varieties, increase plant yields, and substantially increase the production value per acre.

According to the Final EIR, the Carpinteria Valley has 42 separate greenhouse growers, producing a variety of crops. The most common product (grown by 40% of greenhouse growers) is cut flowers, which includes chrysanthemums, gerbera daisies, roses, lilies,

and numerous other varieties. Orchids are grown by nearly 19% of growers, with 15% of growers devoting their operations to potted plants (flowers, greenery, and herbs) and 15% to landscape and nursery plants. Other products include fruits and vegetables (9%, mostly lettuce, tomatoes, cucumbers), starter plants (1 grower) and a distribution center where plants are transported and sold.

The purpose of the overlay district is to identify the location and intensity of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley where unique public viewsheds, prime agriculture, natural assets and community character require protection under the Coastal Act and the County's certified LCP. The stated intent of the CA Overlay is to designate geographic areas of Agriculture I (AG-I) zoned lands in the Carpinteria Valley appropriate to support future greenhouse development and to designate areas appropriate for the preservation of open field agricultural uses. The intent is to ensure well-designed greenhouse development and limit the loss of open field agricultural areas from piecemeal greenhouse expansion by providing well-crafted development standards that protect the water quality, visual resources, and the rural character of the Carpinteria Valley.

Policy 8-5 of the certified LUP calls for the preparation of a master environmental impact review (MEIR) for the valley to adequately assess the potential individual and cumulative impacts of greenhouse development on coastal resources. This is the County's implementation of the MEIR.

### **C. PAST COMMISSION ACTION**

The location and intensity of greenhouse development has a long and controversial history in the Carpinteria Valley. Greenhouse development in Carpinteria Valley was an important issue discussed during the development of a certified Land Use Plan in the early 1980s. In the revised findings (January 14, 1981), the Commission found:

***Greenhouses have far greater adverse impacts on coastal resources than open-field operations; due to associated paving, greenhouses on prime soils do not assure that the maximum amount of prime agricultural land is kept in production as required by Section 30241 of the Act... because of their greater water use, greenhouses threaten the entire agricultural viability of the Valley by reducing the water supply available for agricultural flexibility and leading to overdraft of the groundwater basin which could result in degraded irrigation water quality, increased pumping costs and increased pressures for imported water which traditional agricultural operations may not be able to afford. Also, because of the large amount of coverage by impervious surfaces, greenhouses can contribute to flooding and limit the ability of the groundwater basin to recharge when constructed in the recharge area. And, finally, because greenhouses tend to appear like industrial buildings, they have an adverse impact on scenic coastal views from public roads in the foothills which cannot be mitigated, whereas open field agriculture generally enhances scenic open space values.***



In 1997, the Carpinteria Valley Association (CVA) appealed the County's approval of a 171,000 sq. ft. greenhouse project (Mountain Side Flowers) to the Coastal Commission. In July 1998, the CCC denied the appeal filed by CVA; however, the Commission directed the County to require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for all new greenhouse development over 20,000 sq. ft. until a cumulative impact analysis is completed and the CCC formally agrees to any land use designation or policy changes relating to greenhouse development, as required by Policy 8-5(e) of the certified LCP.

The July 1998 letter to the Board of Supervisors from Commission staff clearly states that:

***“Until a cumulative impact assessment is completed, and the Commission formally agrees to any land use designation or policy changes relating to greenhouse development,...greenhouse facilities over 20,000 sq. ft. in size must receive a CUP from the County and are appealable to the Commission.”***

This Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program LCP amendment is in response to the need for a cumulative impact assessment, thereby eliminating the requirement for Conditional Use Permits for greenhouse development over 20,000 sq. ft.

## **D. AGRICULTURE**

### **1. Coastal Act Policies**

Section 30113 of the Coastal Act defines “prime agricultural land” as

***...those lands defined in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subdivision (c) of Section 51201 of the Government Code.***

Section 51201(c) states in relevant part:

***“Prime agricultural land” means any of the following:***

***All land that qualifies for rating as class I or class II in the Natural Resources Conservation Service land use capability classifications.***

***Land which qualifies for rating 80 through 100 in the Storie Index Rating.***

***Land which supports livestock used for the production of food and fiber and which has an annual carrying capacity equivalent to at least one animal unit per acre as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture.***

***Land planted with fruit- or nut-bearing trees, vines, bushes or crops which have a nonbearing period of less than five years and which will normally return during the commercial bearing period on an annual basis from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant production not less than two hundred dollars (\$200) per acre.***

Section 30241 of the Coastal Act states:

***The maximum amount of prime agricultural land shall be maintained in agricultural production to assure the protection of the areas agricultural***

***economy, and conflicts shall be minimized between agricultural and urban land uses through all of the following:***

***(a) By establishing stable boundaries separating urban and rural areas, including, where necessary, clearly defined buffer areas to minimize conflicts between agricultural and urban land uses.***

***(b) By limiting conversions of agricultural lands around the periphery of urban areas to the lands where the viability of existing agricultural use is already severely limited by conflicts with urban uses or where the conversion of the lands would complete a logical and viable neighborhood and contribute to the establishment of a stable limit to urban development.***

***(c) By permitting the conversion of agricultural land surrounded by urban uses where the conversion of the land would be consistent with Section 30250.***

***(d) By developing available lands not suited for agriculture prior to the conversion of agricultural lands.***

***(e) By assuring that public service and facility expansions and nonagricultural development do not impair agricultural viability, either through increased assessment costs or degraded air and water quality.***

***(f) By assuring that all divisions of prime agricultural lands, except those conversions approved pursuant to subdivision (b), and all development adjacent to prime agricultural lands shall not diminish the productivity of such prime agricultural lands.***

Section 30242 of the Coastal Act states:

***All other lands suitable for agricultural use shall not be converted to nonagricultural uses unless (1) continued or renewed agricultural use is not feasible, or (2) such conversion would preserve prime agricultural land or concentrate development consistent with Section 30250 such permitted conversion shall be compatible with continued agricultural use on surrounding lands.***

Section 30243 of the Coastal Act states:

***The long-term productivity of soils and timberlands shall be protected, and conversions of coastal commercial timberlands in units of commercial size to other uses or their division into units of noncommercial size shall be limited to providing for necessary timber processing and related facilities.***

Section 30250 of the Coastal Act states, in relevant part:

***(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing***

*developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels...*

## **2. Existing LUP Policies**

Policy 8-4 of the LCP states that:

*As a requirement for approval of any proposed land division of agricultural land designated as Agriculture I or II in the land use plan, the County shall make a finding that the long-term agricultural productivity of the property will not be diminished by the proposed division.*

Policy 8-5 of the LUP states:

*All greenhouse projects of 20,000 or more square feet and all additions to existing greenhouse development, i.e., greenhouse expansion, packing sheds, or other development for a total of existing and additions of 20,000 or more square feet, shall be subject to County discretionary approval and, therefore, subject to environmental review under County CEQA guidelines.*

*Prior to issuance of a development permit, the County shall make the findings based on information provided by environmental documents, staff analysis, and the applicant that all significant adverse impacts of the development as addressed in paragraphs "a" through "e" below have been identified and mitigated.*

### **Action**

*The County Resource Management Department shall develop procedures and standards for the environmental impact analysis of greenhouse developments. This action is necessary to ensure that all significant adverse impacts on coastal resources are identified and that mitigation measures are attached to projects as a condition of approval to mitigate individual and cumulative impacts. Such guidelines shall include an evaluation of the following factors for each project:*

- a. An assessment of the individual and cumulative increases in the amount and rate of runoff that would be caused by the proposed project and the potential impact on downstream watercourses. Mitigating measures shall be required to prevent runoff waters from entering overburdened water courses by directing runoff to water courses capable of handling the increased flow, or to collect the runoff and provide for drainage systems adequate to handle the increased flow.*
- b. If the project is located in a groundwater recharge area, a determination of the amount and rate of recharge that would occur if the site were uncovered and the net loss of recharge that will result from the project. Projects will be required to provide for the net potential loss of recharge that will result from the project through the use of impoundment basin where feasible or other means of collecting, storing, and percolating water for the purpose of recharging the groundwater basin.*

- c. Assessment of the impact of materials used for coverage and amount of coverage on the long-term productivity of soils.**
- d. Assessment of the potential adverse impacts of the project on the water quality of affected water bodies and groundwater basins.**

**To this end, the following information shall be required for each greenhouse project:**

- 1. the volume of water runoff or discharge during normal operating conditions and during the rainy season of the year.**
- 2. the types and amounts of pesticides and fertilizers contained in the runoff or discharge.**
- 3. the method for disposing of the runoff or discharge, i.e., a drainage plan, irrigation plan, or other means of determining how the runoff will be managed.**

**The County shall request the Regional Water Quality Control Board to review each greenhouse project for conformance with applicable State statutes and policies and to recommend mitigating measures where necessary. No discharge shall be permitted into enclosed bays and estuaries unless it can be shown that such discharge will not degrade the quality of the receiving waters. In addition, no detectable level of pesticide shall be discharged into surface waters. Mitigation means may include suspension of the runoff and redirection away from the affected waters, treatment of the runoff to remove toxicants and nutrients present, and/or monitoring of discharge from individual greenhouse projects.**

**To implement this policy in the Carpinteria Valley, a program for regular monitoring of the water quality of the Carpinteria Marsh and streams affected by greenhouse development shall be established (see also Recommendation 8, paragraph b(1), Section 3.9)**

- e. Assessment of the potential adverse impacts of the climate control aspects of the project on air quality.**

**In addition to the mitigating measures listed above, other measures necessary to mitigate any adverse impact identified as a result of the evaluation of these and other factors shall be required as a condition of project approval. In order to adequately assess the potential individual and cumulative impacts of greenhouse development on the coastal resources of the Carpinteria Valley, the County should conduct a master environmental impact assessment for the Valley to determine the level of greenhouse development that the Valley's resources can support without experiencing adverse environmental impacts. The County shall seek funding for the preparation of the master environmental impact assessment during the implementation phase of the Local Coastal Program. If the master environmental impact assessment is not completed within three years of the certification of the County's land use plan,**

***greenhouse development (as regulated by Policy 8-5) shall automatically become a conditional use on Agriculture I designated lands in the Carpinteria Valley. If, however, the County and Coastal Commission agree on land use designation or policy changes based on the County's assessment of adverse environmental impacts of greenhouses gathered through the permit process, conditional use permits shall not be required for greenhouse development.***

Policy 8-6 states:

***No greenhouse, hothouse, or accessory structures shall be located closer than 50 feet from the boundary line of a lot zoned residential. In addition, setback and maximum lot coverage requirements shall be as follows:***

<u>Parcel Size</u>	<u>Setbacks</u>	<u>Maximum Lot Coverage for All Structures</u>
Less than 5 acres	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and 20 feet from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	75 percent
5 to 9.99 acres	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	70 percent
10 acres or more	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	65 percent

Policy 8-7 states:

***Landscaping and screening shall be installed within six months of completion of new greenhouses and/or accessory buildings. Such landscaping shall reasonably block the view of greenhouse structures and parking areas from the nearest public road(s) within five years of project completion.***

### **3. Existing IP/CZO Provisions**

Sec. 35-68.7 Setbacks for Buildings and Structures for AG-I Zone District

***1. Front: Fifty (50) feet from the centerline and twenty (20) feet from the right-of-way line of any street.***

***2. Side and Rear: Twenty (20) feet from the lot lines of the lot on which the building or structure is located.***

***3. Lots that contain one gross acre or less shall be subject to the setback regulations of the R-1/E-1 Single Family Residential District.***

***4. In addition, no hothouse, greenhouse, other plant protection, or related structure shall be located within thirty (30) feet of the right-of-way line of any street nor within fifty (50) feet of the lot line of a lot zoned residential. On lots***

***containing five (5) or more gross acres, an additional setback of thirty (30) feet from the lot lines of the lot on which the structure is located is required.***

Sec. 35-68.8 Lot Coverage for AG-I Zone District

***The maximum net lot coverage for all hothouses, greenhouses, and other plant protection structures shall be as follows:***

<b><u>Lot Size</u></b>	<b><u>Maximum Lot Coverage</u></b>
Less than 5 acres	75 percent
5 to 9.99 acres	70 percent
10 acre or more	65 percent

Sec. 35-68.9 Height Limit for AG-I Zone District

***No building or structure shall exceed a height of thirty-five (35) feet.***

Sec. 35-68.11 Landscaping for AG-I Zone District

***None, except that for commercial hothouses, greenhouses, or other plant protection structures, or as otherwise required in the provisions of this district, a landscaping plan must be approved by the Planning and Development Department. Said plan shall include landscaping which, within five years, will reasonably block the view of said structures and on-site parking areas from the nearest public road(s). Said plan shall also include landscaping along all streets. The landscaping plan shall consist of plant material and said plant material shall be compatible with plants grown on the property. All landscaping shall be installed within six months of project completion.***

***Prior to the issuance of any permits, a performance security, in an amount determined by the Planning and Development Department, to insure installation and maintenance for two years, shall be filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. Said performance security shall be released by said Clerk upon a written statement from the County Planning and Development Department that the landscaping, in accordance with the approved landscaping plan has been installed and maintained for two years.***

35-169.2 CDP Applicability.

***j. The following improvements and structures shall be exempt provided that the parcel on which they are located is not within 300 feet of the edge of a coastal bluff or the inland extent of any beach, or not within or contiguous to an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat (ESH) area:***

***vii. In the RR, A-I, and A-II districts, agricultural accessory structures that are roofed and supported by posts or poles, do not exceed 500 square feet of roof area, are unenclosed on all sides, and have no plumbing or electrical facilities.***

#### **4. Discussion**

Most of the parcels within the Carpinteria Valley area have a land use designation of "Agriculture I" and are zoned "Agriculture-I" (AG-I). A range of parcel sizes is permitted

in the AG-I zone. Most of the parcels that are zoned AG-I-5 and AG-I-10 (five and ten acre minimum parcel sizes) are located in the central and southern portions of the study area where the topography is generally level. Most of the parcels that are zoned AG-I-20 and AG-I-40 (twenty and forty acre minimum parcel sizes) are located in the northern portion of the study area where the topography is moderately to steeply sloping. Properties within the study area that have agricultural zoning designations comprise approximately 5,600 acres of the 7,196-acre study area.

Land uses in the project study area consist of open field and orchard agricultural operations, greenhouses and related structures, and residences. Throughout the study area, residential uses are located adjacent to agricultural operations. Many of the residences that are adjacent to greenhouses and open field agricultural operations are within the City of Carpinteria, along the southern border of the project study area. Several small residential communities are also located within the study area, including Serena Park, La Mirada, Ocean Oaks, and Shepard Mesa communities. Within and to the north of the study area, there are numerous individual houses that have been developed on lots that are generally five acres or greater in size.

The combination of mild climatic conditions, prime agricultural soils, available water sources, and proximity to major markets, makes the project study area a valuable agricultural resource. The ability to grow a diverse range of high-yield specialty crops, such as avocados, kiwis, cherimoyas, cut flowers, and nursery stock plants, provides growers with the flexibility to respond to market and environmental changes. Greenhouse production is more intensive and efficient than open field production, resulting in a better quality product and higher yields per acre.

Open field agriculture production in the project study area is dominated by avocado orchards. However, the Valley's unique climate also results in the area being one of the State Leaders in high-yield specialty crops including citrus, cherimoyas, passion fruit, kiwis, bananas and other sub-tropical fruits. Numerous small open field operations are located within the Shepard Mesa area in the eastern end of the Valley and are engaged in the viable production of these specialty crops. Numerous open field growers also use the Valley's unique resources to produce high quality cut flowers and nursery products in the lower reaches of the foothills and throughout the valley flat land. This diversity of crops contributes to the overall agricultural productivity of the area by providing growers with the flexibility to respond to market and environmental changes.

Greenhouse development is currently allowed in each of the AG-I zone designations. However, the majority of greenhouse development has occurred on lands zoned AG-I-5 and AG-I-10 since most AG-I-20 and AG-I-40 parcels occur on steep slopes that are not suitable for greenhouse development. The Revised EIR reports that there are approximately 42 greenhouse growers in the Valley, with farms ranging from small operations (e.g., mostly open fields with one small greenhouse or plant protection structure) to large (entire production in greenhouses). Crop production includes cut flowers and ornamental nursery products including chrysanthemums, gerbera daisies, asters, lilies, orchids and roses, and other products such as potted plants, vegetables,

seeds, bulbs, and vegetable seedlings. Greenhouses contribute substantially to the county's overall agricultural production. While occupying less than 0.1 percent of the County's total harvested acreage, Carpinteria Valley greenhouses produce approximately 12 percent of the total agricultural value, or approximately \$76 million annually (Revised EIR, February 2002 citing 1997 County Agricultural Product Report in SB County, 1999). Greenhouse operations also account for approximately 72 percent of all agricultural employment in the Carpinteria Valley (approximately 913 employees; Revised EIR, February 2002 citing Carpinteria Economic Profile in SB County, 1999).

The Carpinteria greenhouse industry has grown rapidly since first introduced in 1962. Starting with approximately 100,000 square feet of greenhouses and related development, greenhouse use grew to three million square feet by 1970, eight million square feet by 1982, and the current 14.9 million square feet in 1999. The majority of greenhouse development has occurred in the western portion of the study area, south of Highway 192, east of Nidever Road, and west of Linden Avenue. In this area, approximately 9.1 million square feet (209 acres) of greenhouses and related facilities have been developed, which is approximately 60% of the total greenhouse development in the study area. Table 2, below is excerpted from the Revised EIR (February 2002) and summarizes the acreage of greenhouse development associated within each zone district:

The Revised EIR states that it is estimated that approximately 25% of the greenhouses in the project area use hydroponics systems to grow plants and do not use the natural soil resources (Revised EIR, February 2002 citing Santa Barbara County, 1999). The use of hydroponics systems is reported to allow the precise application of plant nutrients, require less labor, reduce water use, and increase plant yields. Other greenhouses in the project study area grow plants in containers, which also results in the production of plant products that do not rely on the use of natural soils resources.

**Table 2. Acreage Within Each Zone District (Revised EIR, February 2002)**

Zoning	AG-Zoned Parcels within Study Area		Existing Greenhouse and Related Development on AG-Zoned Parcels						
	No. of Parcels	Acres (approx)	No. of Developed Parcels	Parcel Acres	Greenhouse Development (approx. sf)	Plant Protection Structure	Shade Structure	Accessory Use	Total Square Footage
AG-I-5	49	329	26	196	3,289,000	445,400	425,300	122,900	4,282,600
AG-I-10	388	3500	52	546	8,826,000	507,900	1,020,000	320,800	10,674,700
AG-I-20	3	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AG-I-40	92	1754	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>526<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>5,636</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>12,115,000</b>	<b>953,300</b>	<b>1,445,300</b>	<b>443,700</b>	<b>14,957,300</b>

<sup>1</sup> Six parcels have split zoning (either AG-I-40/10 or AG-I-40/20). These parcels have been incorporated into individual zoning categories in order to demonstrate acreage in each zone district. Therefore, the total number of agriculture parcels is 526 rather than 532.

Unlike open field or orchard operations, greenhouse agriculture requires the construction of permanent structures and a substantial amount of paving and accessory structures. As the greenhouse industry has expanded, this development has resulted in a significant visual change in the rural character of the valley and has raised issues



related to increased traffic, flooding potential, groundwater recharge, impacts on the Carpinteria Marsh, and conflicts with adjacent residential uses.

It has been argued by growers that one agricultural use is the same as any other agricultural use, and therefore development of greenhouses should be unlimited within agriculturally zoned lands. However, there are clear distinctions between open field agricultural production and greenhouse agricultural production. Greenhouses and related development have a structural presence that is visually similar to a typical commercial/industrial development rather than the open fields traditionally associated with agriculture. Because of their structural nature, greenhouses have readily identifiable impacts, similar to any other type of building, including the potential to impact public views, interfere with public access, increase runoff, cover agricultural soils, reduce foraging habitat, increase glare and light pollution, modify landforms and change rural character. It is notable that trends in the greenhouse design have been changing over time, as illustrated in the Carpinteria Valley. For instance, older greenhouses in the Valley are generally smaller in overall size and height. The older structures generally range in height from 12 to 20 feet, however, growers are moving to taller structures in the 25 to 30-foot range in order to increase the efficiency of temperature regulation. Additionally, growers have moved away from greenhouses at a size that are accessory to open field agriculture to greenhouses of sizes that can stand alone and produce higher rates of return.

In addition to the physical similarities, greenhouse operation is comparable to factory operations, with 24-hour, 7-day-per-week operations, additional traffic, use of energy, lighting, loading/unloading operations, and the need for permanent facilities for employees such as parking and restrooms. Thus in many ways these greenhouses function like an industrial agricultural use, rather than a traditional agricultural use.

As proposed, the LCP amendment includes the addition of the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District to identify the location and intensity of future greenhouse development of over 20,000 sq. ft. and provide siting and design standards to ensure protection of coastal resources. The proposed amendment would regulate the conversion of open field agriculture to greenhouses and greenhouse-related development (e.g., packing houses, driveways, office space, parking).

The certified LCP includes several policies that provide for the long-term protection of agricultural resources (Exhibit 6). Specifically, the LCP incorporates Section 30241, 30242, and 30243 of the Coastal Act as guiding principles. Sections 30241, 30242, and 30243 of the Coastal Act provide for the protection of agricultural *land* and *soils*. Section 30241 calls for the maximum amount of prime agricultural *land* to be maintained in agricultural production. Section 30242 restricts the conversion of *lands* suitable for agricultural use. Section 30243 requires the protection of the long-term productivity of *soils*. The structural nature of greenhouses does not lend itself to the protection of *land* and *soils* in the same way as open field agriculture, nor does it provide for maintaining agricultural land in production when containers or hydroponics or other growing techniques are used which do not rely on in-ground cultivation methods. Greenhouse

development incrementally displaces agricultural land, which could otherwise be put into production, for foundations, footings, walkways, storage areas, boilers, or other ancillary uses. In addition, greenhouse related development may include packing sheds, paved parking and driveways, loading/unloading facilities. Each of these uses contributes to the removal of agricultural land that would not occur under traditional open field farming operations. Even greenhouses that utilize in-ground cultivation measures displace agricultural land to some degree. In addition to the cumulative removal of agricultural land from production, greenhouse development covers agricultural soils with hardscape or other surfaces to varying degrees.

As a result of the incremental removal of land from agricultural production and the covering of soils, the Commission finds that the wholesale conversion of open field agriculture to greenhouse development would be detrimental to the long-term maintenance and protection of agricultural land and soils required by Coastal Act Sections 30241, 30242, and 30243. Therefore the Commission finds that the proposed Area A (greenhouse expansion area) and Area B (rural open fields) will serve to concentrate greenhouse development and limit the density of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley to ensure that agricultural land is maintained in production and the long-term productivity of soils is protected to the maximum extent feasible.

As mentioned above, Section 30241 requires that the maximum amount of prime agricultural land be maintained in agricultural production to protect the area's agricultural economy and that conflicts be minimized between agricultural and urban land uses. Although there is a quasi-industrial component, greenhouses have traditionally been considered an agricultural use to the extent that agricultural products historically grown in soil are the result of a greenhouse operation. Greenhouse development maintains agricultural land in production in the long run providing that the prime soils are utilized or protected in place and not adversely impacted by the greenhouse development itself. Section 30241 requires the *long-term* maintenance of agricultural production and protection of the agricultural economy.

The Carpinteria Valley is uniquely suited to sustain agricultural activities, given the mild year-around temperatures, unique microclimates, extensive areas with prime agricultural soils, available and adequate labor, and excellent solar exposure resulting from its south-facing orientation. The policies of the LUP and Coastal Act require the long-term protection of these agricultural resources and the area's agricultural economy.

The purpose of the proposed LCP amendment is to identify the appropriate area for the location and intensity of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley. In addition to the areas of expansion identified pursuant to Area A, the proposed overlay district allows for a maximum of 20,000 sq. ft. per parcel on other AG-I zoned lots within the Planning Area designated as Area B. By balancing open field agricultural operations with greenhouse development to preserve flexibility and maintain the maximum amount of agricultural soil in production, the Commission finds that identifying the appropriate area for the location and intensity of future greenhouse development will benefit the maintenance of long-term agricultural production in the Carpinteria Valley and protect

the coastal resources identified in Sections 30241, 30242, and 30243. However, to uphold a consistent strategy of designating greenhouse development areas and to ensure consistent implementation of the greenhouse development standards, the Commission finds that Suggested Modification Eight (8) is necessary to ensure that all agriculturally-zoned parcels within the Carpinteria Valley Planning Area have been identified within Area A or Area B. Presently, the County's proposed Overlay District does not show seven agricultural parcels along Foothill Road to be subject to the Overlay District. This is due to a separate LCP amendment (SBV-MAJ-3-02 Toro Canyon) which proposed conversion of these parcels from agriculture to residential. This conversion was denied by the Commission on November 6, 2003. As a result, these parcels were not included in the Overlay District greenhouse requirements.

Future subdivision of AG-I lands would contribute to further intensification of greenhouse development in Area B because the 20,000 sq. ft limit is assigned on a per parcel basis. Area B is intended to preserve open agricultural operations and the rural character of the Carpinteria Valley. An analysis of the parcels in Area B which have the potential to be subdivided (based solely on the lot size and zoning) and which are located on slopes of five percent or less, indicated that there is a potential cumulative buildout of an additional 27 parcels in Area B. If each of these new parcels are constructed with 20,000 sq. ft. of greenhouse development, this would translate to 540,000 sq. ft. of additional greenhouse development in the area intended to protect rural character (Area B). It has been argued that subdivision of agricultural parcels require the County to make a finding that the long-term agricultural productivity of the property will not be diminished by the proposed division. In general, this requirement serves as an impediment to further subdivision of agricultural lands in order to protect the long-term agricultural viability of an area. However, the County interprets greenhouses as agriculture and while greenhouses may be an agricultural development they are also a special subsection of the industry that require structural development similar in appearance and operation to that of commercial/industrial developments. Therefore, the Commission recognizes that greenhouses do not employ the traditional characteristics of agricultural operations, and future interpretations of the "long-term agricultural of the property" may receive separate interpretation. The LCP provisions for the protection of rural character are necessarily subjective and therefore not definitive in their interpretation.

As a result, the potential for subdivision is exists and the Commission finds that the further intensification of Area B through subdivision is contrary to the long-term preservation and flexibility of agricultural production consistent with Section 30241 of the Coastal Act. Therefore, the Commission finds that Modifications Five (5) and Fourteen (14) are necessary to require greenhouse development be approved consistent with the parcels as configured on the date of Commission action on this amendment. Modifications 5 and 14 do not allow additional greenhouse entitlements as a result of divisions of land or rezoning.

Additionally, Section 30241 requires the minimization of conflicts between agricultural and urban land uses. Section 30241 (a) through (e) concern the minimization of

conflicts and therefore apply to all agricultural lands. Section 30241 (a) requires conflicts be minimized by establishing stable boundaries separating urban and rural areas, including where necessary, clearly defined buffer areas to minimize conflicts between agricultural and urban uses. In addition, Section 30250 requires that new development be located “within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it... and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.”

The urban-rural boundary in the Carpinteria Valley area is coterminous with the limits of the City of Carpinteria at the southern end of the proposed Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. The interface of this area is highly developed, primarily with residential uses on the urban side and a significant amount of adjacent greenhouse development on the rural side. The urban-rural boundary in the Carpinteria area is already experiencing significant pressure to allow additional urban growth. This is evidenced by the City of Carpinteria’s General Plan and recent comprehensive update of the certified Land Use Plan. In Carpinteria’s LCP submittal and pursuant to the General Plan Map (not a certified component of the LCP), the City asserted that four areas adjacent to the city merited inclusion in the city because they are either already developed in urban use or, are a “logical extension” of city boundaries given the existing pattern of development or need for public services. During the Comprehensive Plan update process, the City cited the pressing need for housing as a situation of overriding concern.

The Commission recognizes that the pressure for the City to expand its limits will increase as the demand for housing rises. As the pressure to relocate the urban-rural boundary line continues to build, Coastal Act requirements to preserve and protect the maximum amount of coastal agriculture are increasingly jeopardized. In certain cases, under the Coastal Act, land suitable for agriculture may be converted where the viability of existing agricultural use is already severely limited by conflicts with urban uses or where the conversion of the lands would complete a logical and viable neighborhood and contribute to the establishment of a stable limit to urban development. As proposed under this amendment, the County states that restricting major greenhouse development north of Highway 192 and east of Linden Avenue creates a defined, logical greenhouse expansion boundary that maintains development with, and adjacent to, historic clusters and preserves the rural character of the valley. This “logical” boundary essentially dictates the boundary between the structural agricultural associated with greenhouse development and the rural agricultural and foothill area, similar to the concept of the urban-rural boundary for urban and agricultural uses.

As a result of the aforementioned development pressures along the urban-rural boundary in the Carpinteria Valley, the Commission finds that maintaining stable boundaries and clearly defined buffer areas must be maintained to avoid conflicts between agriculture and urban uses. The proposed Overlay District provides additional setbacks from greenhouse development adjacent to residential areas, requiring a one hundred-foot setback from a residentially-zoned lot or fifty (50) feet from an adjacent parcel where there is an approved residential dwelling located within 50 feet of the parcel boundary. One provision of the Overlay District makes exception to the setback

requirements, such that the minimum one hundred-foot setback need not be maintained between loading/unloading areas, driveways and parking areas and adjacent residential properties if shielding or other measures can provide sufficient attenuation to reduce noise at the property line to less than 65 db(A) CNEL. The Commission finds that there are other considerations besides noise as to the compatibility of greenhouse and residential uses, such as the proximity to pesticides or other greenhouse related chemicals and night lighting. Furthermore, the standard to reduce the 100-foot setback requirement does not state how much the setback may be reduced. To ensure that urban and residential uses do not conflict consistent with Sections 30241 and 30250 of the Coastal Act as incorporated by reference into the certified LUP, the Commission suggests Modification Eighteen (18) to delete the text that allows a reduction in the 100-foot setback.

Section 30241 of the Coastal Act requires that the maximum amount of prime agricultural land be maintained in agricultural production, and Section 30243 of the Coastal Act states “the long-term productivity of soils...shall be protected...” These policies are incorporated as guiding principles of the certified LUP agricultural policies. Combined, these policies require maximum protection of prime soils and the productivity of these soils.

Many of the parcels located in the project study area have soils that are classified as being prime (Class I or II) agricultural soils, comprising approximately 1,900 acres of the 7,196-acre study area (Exhibit 13). The remainder of the study area has soils that have been classified as non-prime soils (Class III or IV). Prime agricultural land is determined by four criteria, any of which qualifies the parcel as prime. The first test requires Class I or II soils. The second test requires a Storie Rating Index between 80 and 100. The third test requires the ability to support one livestock animal unit per acre. The fourth test requires land planted with fruit-bearing trees and other crops to return not less than \$200 per acre annually.

The Revised EIR (February 2002) states that the majority of greenhouse owners cultivate in the native soil, maintaining prime soils in agricultural production. Other greenhouse operations, depending upon crop type, use containers or hydroponic systems, foregoing the use of native soils. Although greenhouse operations are considered an agricultural activity, many greenhouse operations do not grow plants in the ground but rather in pots.

The economy can be protected, in part, by allowing continued flexibility to growers. However, indiscriminate expansion of greenhouse development could actually reduce the long-term flexibility of the agricultural resources by building out the valley with large structures and impervious surfaces. Unlimited greenhouse development would create a structural landscape on agricultural lands, including those that are presently in open field agricultural production. While limited greenhouse development may serve to augment existing open field agricultural, the mass conversion of open field agriculture to greenhouse development may undermine the long-term flexibility of crop types and methods. Though it has been stated that greenhouses can be removed and the open

field agricultural operations reinitiated, this is arguably an expensive and time-consuming process. Furthermore the native soils may be modified in a manner that no longer allows them to be readily competitive with respect to agricultural productivity.

The impact of greenhouse development on the productivity of prime soils is specifically addressed in the certified LUP. The LUP states that:

***Under the Coastal Act, greenhouses, although an agricultural activity, are also a type of development and must be evaluated in terms of their impact on the long-term productivity of soils and the preservation of an area's agricultural economy. Issues such as the contribution of greenhouses to increased runoff, loss of groundwater recharge, the effects of soil coverage and compaction, and impacts on visual quality need to be addressed.***

***Greenhouse operations vary in the amount of structural and related land coverage required for production. In the Carpinteria Valley, approximately 60 percent of greenhouse production takes place directly in the underlying soil, the remainder taking place in pots or containers. However, aside from the land reserved for growing, asphalt or concrete coverage is generally used for storage, packing and loading areas, walkways, driveways and parking. The cost of removing greenhouse structures and related coverage can be prohibitive, foreclosing the possibility of returning the land to other types of open field agriculture. In some cases, gravel or sand is substituted as a covering for driveways and parking areas; but this type of coverage can also be detrimental to the future productivity of the soil because of compaction and penetration into the topsoil.***

Greenhouse operations that do not directly utilize the native soils may adversely impact the underlying soil in a number of ways such as compaction, use of soil sterilants or other chemicals, or placement of gravel, concrete, or other hardscape within the confines of the greenhouse structures. As proposed, the overlay district includes a development standard to minimize the covering of prime soils through effective site and building design and the use of permeable surfaces to the maximum extent feasible. This would still allow hardscape areas for necessary walkways, vehicle throughways, or other necessary greenhouse components (e.g., chemical storage areas). However, to ensure that the long-term productivity of prime agricultural soils are protected consistent with Sections 30241 and 30243 of the Coastal Act, the Commission suggests Modification Four (4) to add LUP Policy 8-11 specifying that greenhouse development use the native soil for cultivation where feasible, prohibit use of chemicals that would adversely affect the long-term productivity of the soil, and prohibit the removal of prime soils for use in container grown operations where the plants are sold intact. In addition, to ensure implementation plan consistency with suggested Modification Four (4), the Commission suggests the identical changes be made to Section 35-102E.8 by adding the prime soil protection provisions to the Article II Zoning Code, pursuant to Modification Thirteen (13).

Additionally, the Commission recognizes that the protection of prime soils will occur during the coastal development permit review process, and that the above policies and modifications can only be effectively implemented if proper evaluation of the soil

condition occurs during processing. To ensure that the policies of the certified LCP are effectively implemented, the Commission suggests Modification Ten (10) to require a determination of the extent and location of prime agricultural soils in the project area as well as determination of frequency of chemical applications, as a submittal requirement.

The Commission further finds that the abandonment of greenhouse structures would contribute to a loss of productive agricultural land inconsistent with Section 30241 of the Coastal Act as incorporated by reference into the certified LUP. To ensure maximum protection of prime agricultural lands and ensure the long-term productivity of soils pursuant to Sections 30241 and 30243 of the Coastal Act, the Commission suggests Modification Nineteen (19) to require the removal the greenhouse and greenhouse related development if the greenhouse operation is abandoned (not in operation for 24 consecutive months. Specifically, Modification 19 requires that prior to approval of any project, the property owner must sign a written agreement with Santa Barbara County to remove greenhouse or greenhouse related development, or any portion thereof, if any component of the greenhouse development is abandoned (not in operation for 24 consecutive months). If, after 24 months of non-use for greenhouse purposes, greenhouse activities resume, such activities shall be continued without interruption for longer than 90 days by the subsequent 1 year period, or the facility shall be deemed abandoned and notice of such abandonment shall be served upon the landowner by the County. The property owner shall submit an application for demolition of the applicable development and restoration of agricultural soils in a manner suitable to ensure the site's continued agricultural productivity. This is necessary to ensure the long-term productivity of agricultural lands when the greenhouse development is no longer in use. The removal shall occur within 180 days of issuance of a coastal development permit for removal. To protect and maintain agricultural land and soils, Suggested Modification 19 further requires that greenhouse development shall not be allowed to be converted to non-agricultural uses. Any such conversion would remove agricultural land from production inconsistent with Sections 30241, 30242, and 30243 of the Coastal Act.

Although the proposed amendment is intended to respond to the numerous issues raised by greenhouse development within the Carpinteria Valley, the issues raised by the proposed amendment relative to the protection and maintenance of prime agricultural land are not limited to the Carpinteria Valley alone. The individual and cumulative impacts associated with unregulated development of greenhouses are equally applicable to other agriculturally zoned areas within the County coastal zone, particularly if adequate mitigation or regulatory measures are not available to control the spread or growth of greenhouses to other areas, such as the Gaviota coast. As indicated above (relative to protection and maintenance of prime agricultural land) greenhouse development has taken place at a rapid rate in the Carpinteria Valley since 1986 and the demand for additional greenhouse development is unmet as demonstrated by grower testimony, an existing County application for extensive greenhouse development, and litigation over the greenhouse program (see Section G. New Development and Cumulative Impacts for details). As described above, greenhouse development may have adverse impacts on the long-term productivity of agriculture by displacing areas of agricultural land with hard surfaces and accessory

structures, covering prime soils and other soils suitable for agriculture, increasing conflicts between urban and agricultural land uses, and limiting the flexibility of crop types and methods because the removal of greenhouse development could be overly burdensome.

The pressure for additional greenhouse development combined with the LCP amendment to regulate greenhouse development in Carpinteria Valley is anticipated to push demand into other locations that do not have similar restrictions and are able to accommodate such development. Hence, an unintended consequence of the proposed LCP amendment is the diversion and relocation of the cumulative impact of greenhouse development and of the cumulative impacts that come from it from the Carpinteria Valley to alternative locations. If the same requirements to protect prime agricultural soils are not applied elsewhere in the County, it creates an incentive for greenhouses to be developed outside of the Carpinteria Valley, contrary to the provisions of Sections 30241, 30242, 30243, and 30250. Moreover once the cap on new greenhouse development in carp valley is reached, greenhouse development may be proposed in other agriculturally zoned areas of the county where there is no cap and no square foot limit on greenhouse development per lot.

Therefore to ensure that the accelerated demand and accompanying impacts do not result in new areas of intensive greenhouse development countywide irrespective of the potential individual and cumulative impacts to agricultural resources, the Commission finds that Suggested Modifications Seven (7) and Twenty (20) are necessary to ensure that greenhouse development throughout the County is sited and designed to avoid adverse impacts to coastal resources. Modifications 7 and 20 require that all greenhouses and greenhouse related development, including all additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development, that result in a total of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, obtain a Major CUP in any agriculturally designated zone district. This requirement applies on a countywide basis, unless the area is within the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. A Major CUP is also required for greenhouse development of any size where greenhouse or greenhouse related development is proposed on slopes greater than five percent. The CUP can only be approved when the approving body makes specific findings with regard to coastal resources, including slopes, water quality standards, extension of water and sewage lines, visual resources and rural character, conversion of foraging habitat, coastal access, recreation, traffic, and proximity to other greenhouse development.

The Commission therefore finds that the proposed LUP amendments as submitted are inconsistent with and inadequate to carryout the requirements of Sections 30241, 30242, 30243 and 30250 of the Coastal Act unless modified as suggested above. Furthermore, the proposed IP amendments are not consistent with or adequate to carryout the provisions of the LUP, as modified, unless modified as suggested above.



## **E. VISUAL RESOURCES AND PUBLIC ACCESS**

### **1. Coastal Act Policies**

Coastal Act Section 30210 states that:

***In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private***

Coastal Act Section 30212.5 states:

***Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.***

Section 30250 of the Coastal Act states, in relevant part:

***(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels...***

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states:

***The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.***

Section 30252 of the Coastal Act states:

***The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office***

***buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.***

## **2. Existing LUP Policies**

Policy 4-2:

***All commercial, industrial, planned development, and greenhouse projects shall be required to submit a landscaping plan.***

Policy 4-3:

***In areas designated as rural on the land use plan maps, the height, scale, and design of structures shall be compatible with the character of the surrounding natural environment, except where technical requirements dictate otherwise. Structures shall be subordinate in appearance to natural landforms; shall be designed to follow the natural contours of the landscape; and shall be sited so as not to intrude into the skyline as seen from public view places.***

Policy 4-6:

***Signs shall be of size, location, and appearance so as not to detract from scenic areas or views from public roads and other viewing points.***

Policy 3-14:

***All development shall be designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not suited for development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.***

Policy 7-26:

***All proposed trails for the coastal zone shall be incorporated into the County's Master Plans for hiking, biking, and equestrian trails.***

Policy 8-6 states:

***No greenhouse, hothouse, or accessory structures shall be located closer than 50 feet from the boundary line of a lot zoned residential. In addition, setback and maximum lot coverage requirements shall be as follows:***

<u>Parcel Size</u>	<u>Setbacks</u>	<u>Maximum Lot Coverage for All Structures</u>
Less than 5 acres	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and 20 feet from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	75 percent

5 to 9.99 acres	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	70 percent
10 acres or more	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	65 percent

Policy 8-7 states:

***Landscaping and screening shall be installed within six months of completion of new greenhouses and/or accessory buildings. Such landscaping shall reasonably block the view of greenhouse structures and parking areas from the nearest public road(s) within five years of project completion.***

### **3. Existing IP/CZO Provisions**

Sec. 35-63. Development Standards: Coastal Trails.

***Easements for trails shown on the Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan Parks, Recreation and Trails (non-motorized) maps, shall be required as a condition of project approval for that portion of the trail crossing the lot upon which the project is proposed.***

Sec. 35-68.7 Setbacks for Buildings and Structures.

***1. Front: Fifty (50) feet from the centerline and twenty (20) feet from the right-of-way line of any street.***

***2. Side and Rear: Twenty (20) feet from the lot lines of the lot on which the building or structure is located.***

***3. Lots that contain one gross acre or less shall be subject to the setback regulations of the R-1/E-1 Single Family Residential District.***

***4. In addition, no hothouse, greenhouse, other plant protection, or related structure shall be located within thirty (30) feet of the right-of-way line of any street nor within fifty (50) feet of the lot line of a lot zoned residential. On lots containing five (5) or more gross acres, an additional setback of thirty (30) feet from the lot lines of the lot on which the structure is located is required.***

Sec. 35-68.8 Lot Coverage.

***The maximum net lot coverage for all hothouses, greenhouses, and other plant protection structures shall be as follows:***

<b><u>Lot Size</u></b>	<b><u>Maximum Lot Coverage</u></b>
Less than 5 acres	75 percent
5 to 9.99 acres	70 percent
10 acre or more	65 percent

Sec. 35-68.9 Height Limit.

***No building or structure shall exceed a height of thirty-five (35) feet.***

Sec. 35-68.11 Landscaping.

***None, except that for commercial hothouses, greenhouses, or other plant protection structures, or as otherwise required in the provisions of this district, a landscaping plan must be approved by the Planning and Development Department. Said plan shall include landscaping which, within five years, will reasonably block the view of said structures and on-site parking areas from the nearest public road(s). Said plan shall also include landscaping along all streets. The landscaping plan shall consist of plant material and said plant material shall be compatible with plants grown on the property. All landscaping shall be installed within six months of project completion.***

***Prior to the issuance of any permits, a performance security, in an amount determined by the Planning and Development Department, to insure installation and maintenance for two years, shall be filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors. Said performance security shall be released by said Clerk upon a written statement from the County Planning and Development Department that the landscaping, in accordance with the approved landscaping plan has been installed and maintained for two years.***

#### **4. Discussion**

The Carpinteria Greenhouse Program study area (Exhibit 11) encompasses most of the Carpinteria Valley, which is a long, narrow coastal plain located between the Pacific Ocean and the Santa Ynez Mountains. The Santa Ynez Mountains border the study area to the north and views of the mid- and upper- elevations of the mountains are available from locations throughout the region. The Pacific Ocean and the Carpinteria Marsh are located on the southern border of the project area.

Agricultural operations within the study area include a mix of open fields, orchards, and greenhouse developments. Unlike open field or orchard operations, greenhouse agriculture requires the construction of permanent structures and a substantial amount of hardscape and accessory structures. As the greenhouse industry has expanded, this development has resulted in a significant visual change in the rural character of the valley. As mentioned previously, there is a notable distinction between open field agricultural production and greenhouse agricultural production. Greenhouses and related development have a significant structural component similar to a typical commercial/industrial development, rather than the traditional association of open field agriculture.

Greenhouses are typically constructed using a light-colored, opaque glass, plastic or fiberglass material to cover a frame structure. Sunlight reflecting off greenhouse roofs can generate a substantial amount of glare. Night lighting is often used in greenhouses to assist in the growth of plants. During the development of a plant crop, the lights may be used over a 6-7 week period, for approximately six hours per night. Typically, the lights are timed to be turned on late at night and to be turned off by early morning. In greenhouses, the lights are typically “cycled” or turned on for a short period of time

(e.g., five minutes), then turned off for approximately 25 minutes. In open fields, night lighting is used occasionally, however, the lights are generally not “cycled” but rather left on continuously. Many of the new greenhouses are equipped with “blackout” shades that are deployed automatically and prevent light from escaping from greenhouse structures.

In addition to greenhouses, there are accessory developments associated with greenhouse operations, such as hoop structures, shade structures, packing and shipping facilities, paved parking and driveways, storage sheds, among other accessory structures. Plant protection structures, such as hoop structures, are highly variable in appearance. Plant protection structures may have wooden or PVC frames covered with plastic sheets or similar material. The cover material on the roof and sides can be removed and replaced as necessary to protect plants from sun or to the climate variations. Other plant protection structures may be similar in appearance to a greenhouse, having wooden or aluminum frames, fiberglass roofs, and canvas walls or removable walls for climate control. (Note, as proposed, any hothouse or plant protection structure that does not fall within the definition of shade structure or hoop structure shall be included in the definition of greenhouse, for the purposes of implementing the provisions of the Carpinteria Overlay District.)

Shade structures consist of a frame with no permanent structural elements that are typically covered with sheets of black (permeable) netting. These structures are used to shade plants grown in the soil or in containers upon the soil, and typically have a maximum height of 10 to 12 feet above natural grade.

Accessory and agriculture-related support structures are also associated with greenhouse development. Accessory structures include facilities such as packing sheds, offices, warehouses, and distribution centers that have been developed in support of the agricultural industry, including both greenhouse-related and not greenhouse related operations. Other types of accessory structures include refrigeration buildings, heating and cooling units, nutrient mixing tanks, water tanks, etc. The size of the buildings that have been developed for these uses can vary substantially. Offices and packing sheds may be several thousand square feet in area, while larger warehouses and distribution facilities may be 40,000 sq. ft. or more in floor area and reach heights of up to 29 feet. Perimeter landscaping for such facilities has been highly variable, ranging from no landscaping to extensive screening.

As reported in the Revised EIR, the need for large, full-service packing/distribution facilities (on-site) has been a recent trend in the greenhouse production industry that will likely continue as competition increases. Construction of these facilities adjacent to public view corridors often obstructs foreground, mid-ground, and background views of the mountains, ocean, and open field agriculture. The expansive parking lots, truck loading bays, and wide driveway entrances (necessary to accommodate truck turning radii) contribute to an industrial-like appearance.

The Carpinteria greenhouse industry has grown rapidly since first introduced in 1962. Starting with approximately 100,000 square feet of greenhouses and related development, greenhouse use grew to three million square feet by 1970, eight million square feet by 1982, and the current 14.9 million square feet in 1999. The majority of greenhouse development has occurred in the western portion of the study area, south of Highway 192, east of Nidever Road, and west of Linden Avenue. In this area, approximately 9.1 million square feet (209 acres) of greenhouses and related facilities have been developed, which is approximately 60% of the total greenhouse development in the study area.

There is variation in the appearance of the existing greenhouse developments, due to the varying ages of the structures. The older structures present generally range in height from 12 to 20 feet. As with all greenhouse development within the area, the landscape screening ranges from minimal or no screening to well-screened. However, a considerable amount of the older greenhouses and related structures, particularly those located along the Highway 192 corridor, are generally moderately to well screened from the adjacent roadway by mature landscaping. Newer greenhouses are generally taller than the older greenhouses, and may range in height from 16 to 28 feet in height. These taller structures are more difficult to screen.

Eight parcels within the block between Cravens Land and Nidever Road and three parcels fronting Highway 192 between Cravens Lane and Santa Monica Road have been identified as view corridor parcels by the County (Exhibit 12). The eight-parcel agricultural view lots were identified by the County to contain important public views of the mountains, ocean, open field agriculture, and open space as seen from Via Real, U.S. Highway 101 and State Highway 192. The three other parcels are currently planted with mature orchards and are the last remaining open field parcels with frontage along the south side of Highway 192 between Cravens Lane and Santa Monica Road. These two agricultural view corridors represent a vestige of open field agriculture in the central study area that has not yet been infringed upon by urban or greenhouse development.

This LCP amendment proposes to protect these view corridor parcels by restricting greenhouses and greenhouse related development (including packing and shipping facilities, shade and hoop structures) on identified view corridor parcels to 25% maximum lot coverage, 25-foot absolute building height (12 feet for shade and hoop structures), and 250-foot front setbacks from the public right-of-way to minimize fragmentation of these large blocks of contiguous open field agriculture and to preserve, to the greatest extent feasible, important public view corridors. Shade structures would be subject to all applicable CA Overlay District development standards (required for CDPs), Coastal Development Permit findings, and would be applied to the 25% lot coverage for view corridor parcels.

Coastal Act Section 30251 has been incorporated as a guiding principle into the certified LUP. Section 30251 requires that visual qualities of coastal areas be protected, landform alteration be minimized, and where feasible, degraded areas shall be enhanced and restored. Section 30251 requires that development be sited and

designed to protect views to and along the ocean and other scenic coastal areas. This policy also requires that development be sited and designed to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas. New development must also minimize the alteration of natural landforms, and, where feasible, include measures to restore and enhance visual quality where it has been degraded. In addition, Section 30250 requires that new development be located “within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it... and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.” Furthermore, Policy 4-3 of the certified LUP requires that new development in rural areas be compatible with the character of the surrounding natural environment in height, scale, and design.

The County has assigned a scenic value to these view corridor parcels because they represent the remaining open field agriculture in the central study area that has not yet been infringed upon by urban or greenhouse development. As proposed, these view corridor parcels would be designated for intensified greenhouse development. To address this issue, the LCP amendment proposes to apply performance standards to regulate the maximum lot coverage and height of greenhouses and greenhouse related development on these view corridors parcels. Specifically, Section 35-102E.8 of the Agricultural Overlay District assigns a maximum net lot coverage of 25% on view corridor parcels and requires new greenhouse development be clustered with existing greenhouse development to the greatest extent feasible. To provide an LUP policy basis for this requirement and to ensure adequate protection of visual resources pursuant to Policy 4-3 of the certified LUP and Section 30251 of the Coastal Act, the Commission requires Suggested Modification One (1) which requires the location of greenhouse and greenhouse related development to be clustered with existing greenhouse areas.

Additionally, the Commission suggests Modification Sixteen (16) to provide standards for the siting and design of greenhouse and greenhouse related development that could adversely impact scenic areas, and public views of the ridgelines and natural features visible from scenic public roadways and scenic viewing areas. Modification 16 adds a development standard such that, if there is no feasible building site location on the proposed project site where development would not be visible, then the development shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts on scenic areas and public views of ridgeline and natural features visible from scenic highways or public viewing areas, through measures including, but not limited to, siting development in the least visible portion of the site, reducing maximum height standards, breaking up the mass of new structures, clustering new structures within existing greenhouse development along the edges of the properties to maintain maximum through-view corridor, and incorporating landscape elements. Modification 16 also adds development standards which require avoidance of impacts to visual resources through site selection and design alternatives as the preferred method over landscape screening. Landscape screening, as mitigation of visual impacts shall not substitute for project alternatives including re-siting, or reducing the height or bulk of the greenhouse development.

As stated above, Coastal Act Section 30251 requires new development to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, and, where feasible, include measures to restore and enhance visual quality where it has been degraded. Policy 4-3 of the certified LUP requires that structures be subordinate in appearance to natural landforms and sited so that it does not intrude into the skyline as seen from public view places. Additionally LUP Policy 3-14 requires that new development be designed to fit the topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparation is kept to an absolute minimum. Policy 3-14 further requires that areas of the site which are not suited for development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.

As reported in the County's Revised EIR (February, 2002):

***Historically, greenhouse development in the study area has been constructed on slopes of 5% or less. Of the approximately 2,500 acres of AG-I designated land in the study area meeting this criteria, more than 99% is currently in some form of agricultural production (including greenhouse development, open field, orchards, and fallow land with evidence of historic agricultural use.) Most land that is suitable for greenhouse development has already been converted to agriculture. The remaining 3,100 acres of agriculturally zoned land occurs on slopes in excess of 5%, which is unsuitable for greenhouse development.***

***... Eliminating the opportunity to construct greenhouses on slopes greater than 5% will not create an incentive to bring more natural lands into cultivation, as greenhouse development would not have occurred on these slopes anyway.***

The Commission finds that greenhouse development has the potential to adversely impact visual resources of the Carpinteria Valley as a result of the significant landform alteration from grading and site preparation that would be required for a structure of up to 20,000 sq. ft. (approximately 0.5-acre), inconsistent with Coastal Act Section 30251 and the certified LUP policies. As indicated above, the County determined in its baseline analysis that greenhouses were primarily constructed on slopes of 5% or less, and agricultural lands with slopes in excess of 5% are typically unsuitable for greenhouse development. Furthermore, the County's EIR asserts that greenhouse development would not occur on slopes greater than 5%. This is because few applications are anticipated as a result of the expense required for extensive landform alteration and site preparation, and such development would require discretionary review consistent with the existing hillside, water quality, and other resource protection policies of the certified LCP. Though the County believes that greenhouse development is unlikely on these types of slopes, the Commission finds that clear guidelines are needed specifically for greenhouse development in those areas as the viability of developing greenhouses becomes more economically feasible. Therefore, to ensure that greenhouse development does not result in significant adverse impacts to the visual resources of Carpinteria Valley consistent with Section 30251 of the Coastal Act and LUP Policy 4-3, the Commission requires Modifications Three (3), Nine (9), and Twelve (12) to prohibit greenhouses and greenhouse related development on slopes in excess of 10 percent within the Carpinteria Valley. Additionally Modifications Three (3), Nine (9), and Twelve



(12) allow the County to maintain discretionary approval for any size greenhouse or greenhouse related development, including development of less than 20,000 sq. ft., when located on slopes between 5 and 10 percent. Greenhouse development proposed on slopes between 5 and 10 percent may only be approved when all impacts, including impacts to visual resources, can be mitigated due to site characteristics and design. Because the proposed Area A (intensified greenhouse area) encompasses 5% slopes or less, these modifications specifically address requirements in Area B.

Pursuant to Modifications Three (3), Nine (9), and Twelve (12), greenhouse and greenhouse related development may be approved on 5-10% slopes through a Major Conditional Use Permit (CUP) only if specific findings can be made that evidence that the project will not adversely impact coastal resources, either individually or cumulatively. Three of the required CUP findings specifically address visual impacts: (1) That the project is not proposed on a slope greater than 10 percent; (2) That the project will not adversely affect public coastal views, alter the character of rural open space and open field agricultural and grazing areas, or contribute light pollution to night skies in rural areas; and (3) That development is located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to existing greenhouse development to preserve scenic value and rural character.

As provided in the certified LUP, the scenic resources of the County's coastal zone are of incalculable value to the economic and social well-being of Santa Barbara County. The beauty of the Santa Barbara coastline is the basis of the County's strong tourist and retirement economies and is a source of contributing pleasure for the local populace. As the County's certified LCP notes, the County counts its beaches, sand dunes, coastal bluffs, headlands, wetlands, estuaries, islands, hillsides and canyons, upland terraces and plains, and its rivers among its significant visual resources. These resources are vulnerable to degradation through improper location and scale of building development, blockage of coastal views, alteration of natural of landforms by poor cutting, grading, and filling practices, and by poor design or placement of roadside signs and utility lines.

Views of the Santa Ynez Mountains, ocean, and open space are provided from public viewing locations throughout the study area. So far, greenhouses have been developed within the study area almost exclusively on the gently sloping coastal plain adjacent to the City of Carpinteria. Greenhouse development is concentrated largely south of Highway 192; however, some greenhouse clusters have cropped up north of Highway 192, approaching the base of the foothills (Exhibits 14 and 12). Due to the proximity of greenhouse development to U.S. Highway 101, individual and groups of greenhouses can be seen from several locations from the northbound and southbound lanes of the highway. A large concentration of greenhouses are adjacent to the north side of Highway 101 in the western portion of the Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program study area and are highly visible. Views from Highway 192 to the south consist of agricultural operations including open fields, greenhouses, plant protection and shade structures. Existing greenhouse development that is visible from Highway 192 is concentrated in the western and central portions of the study area, between Nidever

Road and Linden Avenue, where several large development clusters of greenhouses and related structures are located primarily on the south side of the highway. Views to the north from Highway 192 are agricultural in the foreground and mountainous in the background.

Existing greenhouse development often has minimal (20-foot) building setback from the roadway. In addition, the type and effectiveness of landscaping that has been provided adjacent to greenhouse development within the study area varies considerably, ranging from no landscaping to an integrated design of block walls and dense plantings. Landscaping such as a narrow row of trees with wide spaces between each tree provides a partial visual buffer, while a dense row of tall shrubs such as oleander or myoporum provide a complete visual screen from ground level. Dense landscaping, however, can have the unintended effect of limiting or eliminating foreground and middle-ground views of open space area and may provide tunnel-like conditions when there are multiple developments with landscaping at the outer edges of the parcels, along roadways.

Many types of visual buffers have been provided adjacent to existing greenhouse development. Vegetation such as orchard trees make an excellent visual buffer, and present an appearance that is consistent and compatible with the views of other orchards in the region. A greenhouse visual screen located adjacent to Highway 101 incorporates the use of multiple types of landscaping materials, including trees, shrubs, and a block wall. The appearance of the wall could have been softened by the use of clinging vines. In some instances along Highway 192, large shrubs, some of which have been trimmed into hedges, have been planted adjacent to the roadway to serve as a visual buffer. While this type of vegetation makes an effective visual screen for the adjacent greenhouses, the appearance of the screen itself can be somewhat imposing and has an unnatural appearance. This effect is particularly noticeable in places where dense vegetation has been installed on the north and south sides of the highway, creating a “tunnel” effect that blocks mid- and background views.

Policy 4-2 of the LUP requires that a landscape plan be submitted for all greenhouse projects. This policy combined with Policy 8-6 provides the LUP policy basis for landscape screening of greenhouse development. Policy 8-6 requires that landscape and screening be installed within six months of completion of greenhouse development, wherein such landscaping shall reasonably block views of the development within five years of project completion.

The proposed Overlay District includes detailed landscaping requirements for visual screening of all structures and parking areas from adjacent public roads and view corridors. Landscaping within the front setbacks is required to gradually increase in height away from public roadways. Solid wall fencing shall not be relied upon as a primary means of screening. If solid wall screening is implemented the walls shall be screened from public view corridors by dense landscaping and/or covered with attractive climbing vines. Additionally, the landscaping development standards require that dark chain-link security fencing to be screened from public view corridors with

dense landscaping. However, there may also be adverse impacts to visual resources from any chain-link fencing in the public view corridors. Therefore the Commission requires Suggested Modification Fifteen (15) to implement visually mitigating landscaping for all chain-link fencing. Furthermore, Modification 15 requires that fences and walls be sited to avoid impeding views of scenic roads, parks, or other public view areas to ensure consistency with the certified policies, Policy 4-2 and Policy 8-6, of the LUP and Section 30251 of the Coastal Act as incorporated.

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act requires that scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Furthermore, permitted development shall be sited and designed to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. Furthermore, pursuant to Policy 4-3, greenhouse development must be compatible with the character of the surrounding natural environment and be of a height, scale, and design to that effect.

The development of greenhouses and related structures has contributed to a change in the visual character of many of the properties that are located in the project study area. This change has occurred primarily from the conversion of open field agricultural operations to agriculture-related structures, and the resulting loss of open space. In areas where greenhouse development has occurred near roadways, fore-, mid-, and background views from the road are often obstructed by intervening structures and landscaping. When viewed from higher elevations, such as from the foothills to the north, areas with extensive greenhouse development have a white appearance.

To address the impacts to visual resources and rural character of greenhouse development, the County proposes modifications to Policy 8-5 and Policy 8-6 of the LUP and further proposes to implement these policies through the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. These policies and overlay district are devised to mitigate visual impacts and control the density of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley. In addition to identifying specific locations for future intensive greenhouse development and the corresponding development capacity, the overlay district requires greenhouse development to meet height, lot coverage, setbacks, and development standards to minimize environmental impacts and ensure compatibility of land uses.

The existing zoning for greenhouse structures allows a maximum height of 35 feet above finished grade. As proposed under this LCP amendment, the maximum allowed height for greenhouse and greenhouse related development is 30 feet above finished grade, however, for designated view corridor parcels, the height is restricted to a maximum of 25 feet above finished grade. The maximum absolute height of any shade structure or hoop structure shall be limited to no greater than twelve feet above natural grade.

Lot coverage for greenhouse and accessory structures is restricted, pursuant to Policy 8-6, in a graduated scale according to parcel size: 75% maximum lot coverage for lots less than 5 acres, 70% maximum lot coverage for lots between 5 and 9.99 acres, and

65% maximum lot coverage for lots 10 acres or more. The proposed overlay district would remove the maximum percent lot coverage requirement for Area A parcels, except for designated view corridor parcels which would be allowed a maximum of 25% net lot coverage (including all impervious surfaces). In Area B, rather than implement maximum lot coverage on a percentage basis, greenhouse and greenhouse related development would be limited to a maximum cumulative total of 20,000 sq. ft. per parcel.

As proposed, setbacks will be slightly modified (see Table 1 in Section A, Amendment Description). The new setback requirements are more restrictive than required in existing Policy 8-6. The front setback will be increased from 30 feet to 75 feet, except for view corridor parcels which will be required to have a 250-foot setback from the right-of-way of any street. Additionally, greenhouse and greenhouse related development will be required to be setback 100 feet from residentially zoned parcels and 50 feet from parcels with an approved residence within 50 feet of the parcel boundary. Presently, greenhouse development is required to be setback 50 feet from a residentially zoned lot.

The Commission recognizes that there has been substantial growth in greenhouse development within Carpinteria and that there is continued trend for growth in that sector of the industry. Since the early 1980s, the valley's greenhouse development has nearly doubled to its current expanse of approximately 15 million square feet. Greenhouses have the effect of transforming the visual character of the valley from rural, orchard and fields, into a structure-dominated character that is more representative of an urban area, reducing the rural appearance of the agricultural valley.

As dictated by their function, greenhouse structures are bulky in shape and are generally plain in appearance. On-site warehouses and distribution facilities approach heights of 30 feet and have often been constructed close to roadways for easy access. The expansive parking lots, truck loading bays, and wide driveway entrances can create a visually prominent industrial appearance that is inconsistent with the rural character of the area. In addition to the structural mass, greenhouse development contributes to daytime glare from sunlight reflecting off of greenhouse and night lighting within the structures. These impacts have the ability to reduce enjoyment of the public from public viewing areas, trails, and vistas as a result of the glare from the translucent rooftops, as seen from the hillsides.

The Commission finds that the potential buildout of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley, if it continues under present trends and regulation, has the potential to transform the rural valley to a structured, quasi-industrial landscape. The incremental conversion of the open space to a structural developed landscape, if not controlled, has the potential to adversely impact the scenic and visual qualities and overall rural character of the Carpinteria Valley. The Commission finds, that by limiting the total development potential, while preserving the large blocks of existing open field agricultural areas, is protective of rural character. The proposed Overlay District delineates the level of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley into two areas:

(1) Area A identifies the location that will support intensified greenhouse development and (2) Area B allows a maximum total of 20,000 sq. ft. of cumulative greenhouse development per parcel (except where it meets requirements under the detailed amnesty and grandfathering provisions).

However, one aspect of this buildout potential has not been addressed under the proposed LCP amendment. Future subdivision of AG-I lands would contribute to further intensification of greenhouse development in Area B because the 20,000 sq. ft limit is assigned on a per parcel basis. Area B is intended to preserve open agricultural operations and the rural character of the Carpinteria Valley. An analysis of the parcels in Area B which have the potential to be subdivided (based solely on the lot size and zoning) and which are located on slopes of five percent or less, indicated that there is a potential cumulative buildout of an additional 27 parcels in Area B. If each of these new parcels are constructed with 20,000 sq. ft. of greenhouse development, this would translate to 540,000 sq. ft. of additional greenhouse development in the area intended to protect rural character (Area B). While greenhouses may be an agricultural development they are also a special subsection of the industry that require structural development similar in appearance and operation to that of commercial/industrial developments.

If the subdivision of agricultural parcels were to occur, this would allow an additional 20,000 sq. ft. greenhouse development per parcel in Area B, thereby contributing to incremental conversion of open field agriculture or open space to structural development. This subdivision would result in further greenhouse development intensification in Area B. The Commission finds that this intensification would be individually and cumulatively inconsistent with the protection of visual resources and community character required by Coastal Act Sections 30251 and 30250. Therefore, the Commission suggests Modifications Five (5) and Fourteen (14) which require that greenhouse development be approved consistent with the parcels as configured on the date of Commission action on this amendment. Modifications 5 and 14 do not allow additional greenhouse entitlements as a result of divisions of land or rezoning.

The Commission recognizes that locating the intensive greenhouse development appropriately, is the first step to mitigate the cumulative impacts of greenhouse development on coastal resources, including visual resources. However, the impact specific to each new development project must additionally be mitigated through applicable performance standards. In particular, the covering of agricultural lands with hardscape and structures contribute to the incremental loss of open space, and adversely impact the valley's rural character. Therefore, to ensure preservation of community character and scenic resources of the rural Carpinteria Valley consistent with Coastal Act Section 30251, as incorporated by reference into the certified LUP, the Commission suggests Modification One (1) to requires the location of greenhouse and greenhouse related development to be clustered with existing greenhouse development and Modification Two (2) to specify the 20,000 maximum square footage requirement for Area B consistent with the specification of other maximum lot coverage requirements called out within the LUP.

To ensure the long-term preservation of the scenic and visual qualities of the rural Carpinteria Valley, the Commission further suggests Modification Nineteen (19) to require the removal the greenhouse and greenhouse related development if the greenhouse operation is abandoned (not in operation for 24 consecutive months). Specifically, Modification 19 requires that prior to approval of any project, the property owner must sign a written agreement with Santa Barbara County to remove greenhouse or greenhouse related development, or any portion thereof, if any component of the greenhouse development is abandoned (not in operation for 24 consecutive months). If, after 24 months of non-use for greenhouse purposes, greenhouse activities resume, such activities shall be continued without interruption for longer than 90 days by the subsequent 1 year period, or the facility shall be deemed abandoned and notice of such abandonment shall be served upon the landowner by the County. The property owner shall submit an application for demolition of the applicable development and the removal shall occur within 180 days of issuance of a coastal development permit for removal.

Through implementation of Modification 19, the County will ensure that abandoned greenhouses do not become a visual blight. Abandoned structures of any kind are often neglected, and after years of inadequate repair and maintenance and neglect of landscaping elements, the condition may decline substantially enough to impact coastal views.

Although the proposed amendment is intended to respond to the numerous issues raised by greenhouse development within the Carpinteria Valley, the issues raised by the proposed amendment relative to the protection visual resources and rural character are not limited to the Carpinteria Valley alone. The individual and cumulative impacts associated with unregulated development of greenhouses are equally applicable to other agriculturally zoned areas within the County coastal zone, particularly if inadequate mitigation or regulatory measures are not available to control the spread or growth of greenhouses to other areas, such as the Gaviota coast. As indicated above (relative to protection of visual resources and community character) greenhouse development has taken place at a rapid rate in the Carpinteria Valley since 1986 and the demand for additional greenhouse development is unmet as demonstrated by grower testimony, an existing County application for extensive greenhouse development, and litigation over the greenhouse program (see Section G. New Development and Cumulative Impacts for details). As described above, greenhouse development may have adverse impacts on visual resources and community character by blockage or interference of public views, increase in light and glare, modification of landforms through site preparation and change to rural character as a result of the quasi-industrial structural appearance of greenhouse development.

The pressure for additional greenhouse development combined with the LCP amendment to regulate greenhouse development in Carpinteria Valley is anticipated to push demand into other locations that do not have similar restrictions and are able to accommodate such development. Hence, an unintended consequence of the proposed LCP amendment is the diversion and relocation of the cumulative impact of greenhouse

development and of the cumulative impacts that come from it from the Carpinteria Valley to alternative locations. If the same requirements are not applied elsewhere in the County, it creates an incentive for greenhouses to be developed outside of the Carpinteria Valley, contrary to the provisions of Sections 30251 and 30250. Moreover once the cap on new greenhouse development in carp valley is reached, greenhouse development may be proposed in other agriculturally zoned areas of the county where there is no cap and no square foot limit on greenhouse development per lot.

Therefore to ensure that the accelerated demand and accompanying impacts do not result in new areas of intensive greenhouse development countywide irrespective of the potential cumulative impacts to visual resources and rural character, the Commission finds that Suggested Modifications Seven (7) and Twenty (20) are necessary to ensure that greenhouse development throughout the County is sited and designed to avoid adverse impacts to coastal resources. Modifications 7 and 20 require that all greenhouses and greenhouse related development, including all additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development, that result in a total of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, obtain a Major CUP in any agriculturally designated zone district. This requirement applies on a countywide basis, unless the area is within the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. A Major CUP is also required for greenhouse development of any size where greenhouse or greenhouse related development is proposed on slopes greater than five percent. The CUP can only be approved when the decision making body makes specific findings with regard to coastal resources, including slopes, water quality standards, extension of water and sewage lines, visual resources and rural character, conversion of foraging habitat, coastal access, recreation, traffic, and proximity to other greenhouse development.

#### Public Access

To carry out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, PRC Section 30210 provides that maximum access and recreational opportunities be provided consistent with public safety, public rights, private property rights, and natural resource protection. Coastal Act Section 30212.5 provides that wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area. Section 30252 calls for the location and amount of new development to maintain and enhance public access to the coast, by among other ways, providing non-automobile circulation, adequate parking, and public transportation.

The proposed LCP amendment includes policy language that requires the preparation of a Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), in a manner consistent with the area's rural and semi-rural character. The TIP will address any necessary long-term improvements to roadways and alternative transportation facilities in the Planning Area, including any appropriate traffic calming measures, designed to maintain public safety and acceptable levels of service on roadways and intersections. The network of roads within the Carpinteria Planning Area serve as alternative routes of access to the coast. Foothill Road is a significant east-west trending road connecting to several roads including

Cravens Lane, Nidever Road, and Toro Canyon Road. Foothill Road is known to experience heavy use by recreational bicyclists. To maintain access, recreation, and alternative transportation to the coast, Suggested Modification Six (6) specifically requires the TIP to include a bicycle route improvement plan that will address conflicts with greenhouse related truck traffic trips.

For the reasons above, the Commission finds that the proposed LUP amendments as submitted are inconsistent with and inadequate to carryout the requirements of Sections 30210, 30212.5, 30250, 30251, and 30252 of the Coastal Act unless modified as suggested above. Furthermore, the proposed IP amendments are not consistent with or adequate to carryout the provisions of LUP Policies 4-2, 4-3, 3-14, 8-6, and Sections 30250, 30251, and 30252 of the Coastal Act, as incorporated into the certified LUP, as modified, unless modified as suggested above.

## **F. WATER QUALITY**

### **1. Coastal Act Policies**

Section 30230 states:

***Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.***

Section 30231 of the Coastal Act states that:

***The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, minimizing alteration of natural streams.***

Section 30250 of the Coastal Act states, in relevant part:

***(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable***



*parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels...*

## **2. Existing LUP Policies**

Policy 2-2:

*The long term integrity of groundwater basins or sub-basins located wholly within the coastal zone shall be protected. To this end, the safe yield as determined by competent hydrologic evidence of such a groundwater basin or sub-basin shall not be exceeded except on a temporary basis as part of a conjunctive use or other program managed by the appropriate water district...*

Policy 2-5:

*Water-conserving devices shall be used in all new development.*

Policy 3-12:

*Permitted development shall not cause or contribute to flood hazards or lead to expenditure of public funds for flood control works, i.e., dams, stream channelizations, etc.*

Policy 3-14:

*All development shall be designed to fit the site topography, soils, geology, hydrology, and any other existing conditions and be oriented so that grading and other site preparations is kept to an absolute minimum. Natural features, landforms, and native vegetation, such as trees, shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible. Areas of the site which are not suited for development because of known soil, geologic, flood, erosion or other hazards shall remain in open space.*

Policy 3-19:

*Degradation of the water quality of groundwater basins, nearby streams, or wetlands shall not result from development of the site. Pollutants, such as chemicals, fuels, lubricants, raw sewage, and other harmful waste, shall not be discharged into or alongside coastal streams or wetlands either during or after construction.*

Policy 9-11:

*Wastewater shall not be discharged into any wetland without a permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board finding that such discharge improves the quality of the receiving water.*

Policy 9-14:

*New development adjacent to or in close proximity to wetlands shall be compatible with the continuance of the habitat area and shall not result in a reduction in the biological productivity or water quality of the wetland due to runoff (carrying additional sediment or contaminants), noise, thermal pollution, or other disturbances.*

### **3. Existing IP/CZO Policies**

Sec. 35-97.9. ESH Environmentally Sensitive Overlay District: Development Standards for Wetland Habitats (in relevant part).

***...6. Wastewater shall not be discharged into any wetland without a permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board finding that such discharge improves the quality of the receiving water.***

***9. New development adjacent to or in close proximity to wetlands shall be compatible with the continuance of the habitat area and shall not result in a reduction in the biological productivity or water quality of the wetland due to runoff (carrying additional sediment or contaminants), noise, thermal pollution, or other disturbances.***

Sec. 35-97.18. ESH Environmentally Sensitive Overlay District: Development Standards for Native Plant Community Habitats (in relevant part).

***Examples of such native plant communities are: coastal sage scrub, chaparral, coastal bluff, closed cone pine forest, California native oak woodland (also individual oak trees), endangered and rare plant species as designated by the California Native Plant Society, and other plants of special interest such as endemics.***

***...2. When sites are graded or developed, areas with significant amounts of native vegetation shall be preserved. All development shall be sited, designed, and constructed to minimize impacts of grading, paving, construction of roads or structures, runoff, and erosion on native vegetation. In particular, grading and paving shall not adversely affect root zone aeration and stability of native trees.***

Sec. 35-97.19. ESH Environmentally Sensitive Overlay District: Development Standards for Stream Habitats.

***1. The minimum buffer strip for streams in rural areas, as defined by the Coastal Land Use Plan, shall be presumptively 100 feet, and for streams in urban areas, 50 feet. These minimum buffers may be adjusted upward or downward on a case-by-case basis. The buffer shall be established based on an investigation of the following factors and after consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game and California Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to protect the biological productivity and water quality of streams:***

- a. Soil type and stability of stream corridors.***
- b. How surface water filters into the ground.***
- c. Slope of land on either side of the stream.***
- d. Location of the 100-year flood plain boundary.***

***Riparian vegetation shall be protected and shall be included in the buffer. Where riparian vegetation has previously been removed, except for***

*channelization, the buffer shall allow for the re-establishment of riparian vegetation to its prior extent to the greatest degree possible.*

*2. No structures shall be located within the stream corridor except: public trails, dams for necessary water supply projects; flood control projects where no other method for protecting existing structures in the flood plain is feasible and where such protection is necessary for public safety or to protect existing development; and other development where the primary function is for the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat. Culverts, fences, pipelines, and bridges (when support structures are located outside the critical habitat) may be permitted when no alternative route location is feasible. All development shall incorporate the best mitigation measures feasible.*

*3. Dams or other structures that would prevent upstream migration of anadromous fish shall not be allowed in streams targeted by the California Department of Fish and Game unless other measures are used to allow fish to bypass obstacles. These streams include: San Antonio Creek (Los Alamos area), Santa Ynez River, Jalama Creek, Santa Anita Creek, Gaviota Creek, and Tecolote Creek.*

*4. All development, including dredging, filling, and grading within stream corridors shall be limited to activities necessary for the construction of uses specified in paragraph 2 of this Section, above. When such activities require removal of riparian plant species, re-vegetation with local native plants shall be required except where undesirable for flood control purposes. Minor clearing of vegetation for hiking, biking, and equestrian trails shall be permitted.*

*5. All permitted construction and grading within stream corridors shall be carried out in such a manner as to minimize impacts from increased runoff, sedimentation, biochemical degradation, or thermal pollution.*

*6. Other than projects that are currently approved and/or funded, no further concrete channelization or other major alterations of streams in the Coastal Zone shall be permitted unless consistent with the provisions of P.R.C. § 30236 of the Coastal Act.*

#### **4. Discussion**

Greenhouse development and greenhouse related development has the potential to adversely impact coastal water quality through erosion and sedimentation, increase of impervious surfaces, increase of runoff, irrigation practices, waste management, the use of pesticides, fertilizers and nutrients, and the management of effluent from septic systems. The Revised EIR states that greenhouse development has historically impacted surface water quality through the discharge of nutrients and pesticides in runoff waters.

Sections 30230 and 30231 of the Coastal Act mandate that marine resources and coastal water quality shall be maintained and where feasible restored, protection shall

be given to areas and species of special significance, and that uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain biological productivity of coastal waters. Section 30250 requires that development be concentrated and in a manner that does not create significant adverse impacts either individually or cumulatively on coastal resources. These Coastal Act policies are incorporated by reference into the certified LCP.

The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB) has taken some recent steps to evaluate the impact of greenhouse development and greenhouse related development in Carpinteria Valley on water quality, and to minimize this impact through outreach and enforcement measures. These actions are described in a CCRWQCB Executive Officer Report dated December 13, 2002 (Exhibit 9), summarized below.

***In July 2001, the Executive Officer of the CCRWQCB sent a letter to all greenhouse owners and operators that advised them of the legal requirements regarding wastewater discharges and recommended that they cease all discharges without a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit or submit an application for an NPDES permit if they intend to continue to discharge wastewater. As a follow up, in August 2001, a Regional Board subcommittee conducted a public workshop to discuss issues raised in the July 2001 letter. Subsequently, all 51 greenhouse and nursery operators, representing more than 175 greenhouses, responded to the July 2001 letter request, and almost all stated they intended to cease discharging to surface waters and provided compliance time schedules and plans to do so. Since then, almost all of the discharges have been eliminated. Regional Board staff will continue to address the few remaining discharges.***

Coastal Commission staff had recent discussions with Mike Higgins, staff member of the CCRWQCB and author of the report cited above. Mr. Higgins indicated that the CCRWQCB has received a 100% response from greenhouse owners in the Carpinteria Valley to eliminate their wastewater discharge. A majority of greenhouse operators have already done so, and the rest are in the process of working with the CCRWQCB to convert their operations to no discharge. Mr. Higgins stated that any future greenhouses that are developed and operated in Carpinteria Valley would be required to obtain a CCRWQCB permit if they have any proposed discharge.

Greenhouse development will result in an increase in impervious surface, which in turn decreases the infiltrative function and capacity of existing permeable land on site. The reduction in permeable area therefore leads to an increase in the volume and rate of stormwater runoff that can be expected to leave the site. Therefore, greenhouse development has the potential to contribute to downstream flooding and erosion if not properly mitigated. The proposed LCP amendment requires the minimization of impervious surfaces. In addition, the proposed LCP amendment requires mitigation for increased stormwater runoff from all new greenhouse development, unless exempted by the Flood Control District. The Commission recognizes that all greenhouse development, including greenhouse related development (such as driveways and loading bays), will result in an increase in impervious surfaces, and, therefore, all

greenhouse development shall require mitigation for increased stormwater runoff. To ensure that greenhouse development does not contribute to downstream flooding, erosion or water quality degradation consistent with the LUP policies, the Commission suggests Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.2., which deletes text that allows an exemption by the Flood Control District, adds text that requires all greenhouse development and greenhouse related development to mitigate for increased storm water runoff from development of the project site, and adds text requiring that the design of storm water drainage facilities comply with County Water Agency standards and guidelines, in addition to Flood Control District standards.

An increase of impervious surface leading to an increase in stormwater runoff volume and rate leaving the developed site also has the potential to contribute more polluted runoff to downstream areas. An increased amount of stormwater runoff can carry with it more pollutants, and these pollutants have a reduced chance for infiltration as the stormwater passes over impermeable areas. The Revised EIR states that stormwater runoff from greenhouse operations has the potential to degrade the surface water quality of the study area and the Carpinteria Salt Marsh, and the adjacent ocean intertidal zone with elevated levels of stormwater runoff pollutants. In order to find the proposed development consistent with the LUP policies, the Commission finds it necessary to require the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to control the pollutant load of stormwater leaving the developed site where the potential for water quality impacts exists. Therefore, to protect water quality consistent with the LUP policies, the Commission suggests Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.20, which adds language requiring the implementation of post-construction structural treatment control BMPs for greenhouse development and greenhouse related development if determined necessary for the protection of water quality by the County on a case-by-case basis. This is consistent with the County's current requirements for commercial and industrial development implemented through their Storm Water Management Program (SWMP). While these post-construction structural treatment control BMPs are primarily aimed at pollutant load reductions, they often provide runoff volume and rate control as well.

In similar types of development to greenhouses and similar areas of the coast, the Commission has previously required structural BMPs to accommodate (infiltrate, filter or treat) the amount of stormwater produced by all storms up to and including the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, 24 hour storm event. The County of Santa Barbara has adopted standards that include sizing criteria for volume-based and flow rate-based structural treatment control BMPs, as described below in an excerpt from the Santa Barbara County Draft Storm Water Management Program.

***These standard conditions will be required on all new or redevelopment projects that are one acre or larger in size for residential development, or 0.5 acre or larger in size for commercial, industrial, and transportation/vehicle development. The conditions require treatment control BMPs be installed to accommodate rainfall events up to 1.2 inches in volume, or 0.3 inches per hour. Events or flows greater than this would be by-passed. This sizing criterion is based on storm event analysis and continuous rainfall/runoff simulation (SYNOP and SWMM) on rainfall data from 1948 to 1999.***

***The criteria for Santa Barbara County did not analyze 24-hour storms as this typically truncates many storm events artificially (i.e., storm events often begin and end before and after midnight, respectively) and is not how storm events actually occur. The approach used to obtain the 1.2 inch sizing criteria was based on the U.S. EPA statistical rainfall analysis program SYNOP, which was used to convert the hourly rainfall data to individual storm events with inter-event mean times (the dry period used to separate and aggregate hours of rainfall into “events”) of 6 hours or greater and total rainfall depth of 0.1 inches or greater (storms less than 0.1 inch were omitted because they do not typically generate creek flows or significant runoff). Thus, these values provide a more accurate value than the 85th percentile value commonly used in other communities (if converted to a percentile approach, these values represent a range between the 70th to 90th percentile, depending on where in the County rainfall is measured).***

Based on the discussion above, the Commission finds that the County design criteria standards provide equivalent water quality protection as the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile design standard. Therefore, to ensure the proposed LCP amendment will minimize adverse impacts to coastal resources and water quality consistent with the LUP policies, the Commission suggests Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.20., which requires that the post-construction structural treatment control BMPs that are required be designed and installed consistent with County Flood Control District and County Water Agency standards and guidelines, including accommodating rainfall events up to 1.2 inches in volume or 0.3 inches per hour.

The storage of fertilizers, pesticides, and other toxic or hazardous substances is also a concern for protecting water quality. If these chemicals are not stored and contained properly, spills and/or stormwater runoff can contribute to water quality degradation. The proposed LCP amendment specifies requirements for the design of storage facilities for compost, pesticides, herbicides and fertilizers to minimize leachate and polluted runoff. To ensure that water quality is protected from spills or runoff of toxic or hazardous substances consistent with the LUP policies, the Commission suggests Modifications Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.4. and Sec. 35-102E.9.A.5., which add language that requires covering all storage areas for protection from stormwater that could result in polluted runoff. This modification also requires that storage areas are located outside of the 100-year flood plain.

Greenhouse development also has the potential to impact water quality through discharge of wastewater or irrigation runoff, which can contain several pollutants including domestic sewage, brine, fertilizers, pesticides and nutrients. The proposed LCP amendment includes provisions for disposal of domestic wastewater through a private septic system with adequate setbacks and expansion area, consistent with the LUP policies. In addition, the Commission suggests Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.6., which requires that any proposed discharge of high saline brines shall comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board discharge requirements.

The proposed LCP amendment also requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to be prepared and implemented for greenhouse development and

greenhouse related development 20,000 square feet or more. This Water Quality Management Plan includes proposed measures to recycle water and nutrients, use Integrated Pest Management practices, and reduce surface water runoff. A Regional Water Quality Control Board permit is required for any wastewater discharge. The Revised EIR states that greenhouse buildout has the potential to degrade the surface water quality through the discharge of irrigation and surface runoff water containing fertilizers and other agricultural chemicals. The Commission recognizes that all greenhouse development, regardless of size, has the potential to impact water quality through polluted runoff. Therefore, to ensure that water quality is protected from polluted runoff, consistent with the LUP policies, the Commission suggests Modifications Ten (10) Sec. 35-102E.6. 1.i. and 2.a. and Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.21., which require a WQMP to be developed for all greenhouse development and greenhouse related development, removing the 20,000 square foot minimum requirement. In addition, suggested Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.21. adds language requiring water conservation measures, a nutrient management plan designed to minimize nutrient loss, and the minimization of pesticide use. A description of all post-construction BMPs, including the location and design, is also required. The Revised EIR states that construction and reconstruction of greenhouses has the potential to degrade the surface water quality within the study area and the Carpinteria Salt Marsh with elevated levels of silt/sediment. Therefore, to ensure that water quality is not degraded by sedimentation caused by construction of greenhouses, consistent with LUP policies, suggested Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.21. adds language requiring an erosion and sediment control plan be prepared and implemented during the construction phase of development as part of the WQMP, and also requires the use of soil conservation techniques that reduce erosion and sedimentation.

Finally, suggested Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.21. encourages the implementation of measures to eliminate the need for discharge of wastewater or irrigation runoff. Where a discharge is proposed, RWQCB staff will determine the appropriate regulatory requirements for the specific discharge. Any discharge to land such as a percolation pond or evaporation pond shall require reporting to the RWQCB through an application for a Waste Discharge Requirement. Discharges to surface water shall be reported through an application for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. These types of discharge requirements typically include specific limitations for the make-up of the discharge (i.e. numerical limits for different pollutants), as well as monitoring and reporting requirements. The discharge requirements may not require particular BMPs, but may suggest BMP alternatives that can be implemented to meet the requirements. The RWQCB may also require treatment for any proposed irrigation or wastewater discharge to surface water.

Where a discharge is proposed, it may be deemed necessary by the County to require an irrigation water detention system. The proposed LCP amendment requires a detention system to only be considered for greenhouse development 20,000 square feet or more. The Commission recognizes that all greenhouse development, regardless of size, has the potential to impact water quality through polluted runoff. Therefore, to ensure that water quality is protected from polluted runoff, consistent with the LUP

policies, the Commission suggests Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.22., which requires the consideration of an irrigation water detention system for all greenhouse development and greenhouse related development, removing the 20,000 square foot minimum requirement.

The Carpinteria Valley Water District (CVWD) currently has a groundwater monitoring program in the Carpinteria Valley. As stated in the Revised EIR, greenhouse buildout has the potential to degrade the groundwater quality through the discharge of irrigation and surface runoff water containing fertilizers and other agricultural chemicals. The proposed LCP amendment requires the applicant for greenhouse development 20,000 square feet or more to reimburse CVWD for costs related to additional groundwater testing and reporting as deemed necessary by CVWD. The proposed LCP amendment also requires further review of a greenhouse facility and operations if nitrate loading is found to be in excess of CVWD standards. The Commission recognizes that all greenhouse development, regardless of size, has the potential to impact groundwater quality through the discharge of polluted runoff. The Commission also recognizes that new greenhouse and greenhouse related development that may degrade water quality should be monitored, and that CVWD should determine the necessity and requirements for this monitoring considering their current program. Finally, the Commission recognizes that a plan to modify greenhouse operations or other necessary enforcement action must be implemented if standards are exceeded. Therefore, to protect groundwater quality consistent with the LUP policies, the Commission suggests Modification Seventeen (17) Sec. 35-102E.9.A.23., which allows CVWD to determine the necessary groundwater testing and reporting required to monitor nitrate loading of groundwater caused by the applicant's development for all greenhouse development and greenhouse related development, removing the 20,000 square foot minimum requirement. In addition, this suggested Modification adds language that allows CVWD to either require the applicant to conduct the monitoring and reporting or to reimburse CVWD for monitoring and reporting. This gives CVWD the discretion to determine the necessary monitoring requirements in conjunction with their current monitoring program. Finally, the suggested Modification adds language requiring the implementation of a plan to modify greenhouse operations to address an exceedance of CVWD standards. In addition, CVWD may take other necessary enforcement action, as applicable, to respond to an exceedance of their standards.

Although the proposed amendment is intended to respond to the numerous issues raised by greenhouse development within the Carpinteria Valley, the issues raised by the proposed amendment relative to water quality are not limited to the Carpinteria Valley alone. The individual and cumulative impacts associated with unregulated development of greenhouses are equally applicable to other agriculturally zoned areas within the County coastal zone, particularly if inadequate mitigation or regulatory measures are not available to control the spread or growth of greenhouses to other areas, such as the Gaviota coast. As indicated above (relative to water quality) greenhouse development and greenhouse related development has the potential to adversely impact coastal water quality through erosion and sedimentation, increase of impervious surfaces, increase of runoff, irrigation practices, waste management, the use



of pesticides, fertilizers and nutrients, and the management of effluent from septic systems.

The pressure for additional greenhouse development combined with the LCP amendment to regulate greenhouse development in Carpinteria Valley is anticipated to push demand into other locations that do not have similar restrictions and are able to accommodate such development. Hence, an unintended consequence of the proposed LCP amendment is the diversion and relocation of the cumulative impact of greenhouse development and of the cumulative impacts that come from it from the Carpinteria Valley to alternative locations. If the same requirements are not applied elsewhere in the County, it creates an incentive for greenhouses to be developed outside of the Carpinteria Valley, contrary to the provisions of Sections 30230, 30231, and 30250. Moreover once the cap on new greenhouse development in carp valley is reached, greenhouse development may be proposed in other agriculturally zoned areas of the county where there is no cap and no square foot limit on greenhouse development per lot.

Therefore to ensure that the accelerated demand and accompanying impacts do not result in new areas of intensive greenhouse development countywide irrespective of the potential individual and cumulative impacts to agricultural resources, the Commission finds that Suggested Modifications Seven (7) and Twenty (20) are necessary to ensure that greenhouse development throughout the County is sited and designed to avoid adverse impacts to coastal resources. Modifications 7 and 20 require that all greenhouses and greenhouse related development, including all additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development, that result in a total of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, obtain a Major CUP in any agriculturally designated zone district. This requirement applies on a countywide basis, unless the area is within the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. A Major CUP is also required for greenhouse development of any size where greenhouse or greenhouse related development is proposed on slopes greater than five percent. The CUP can only be approved when the approving body makes specific findings with regard to coastal resources, including slopes, water quality standards, extension of water and sewage lines, visual resources and rural character, conversion of foraging habitat, coastal access, recreation, traffic, and proximity to other greenhouse development.

The implementation of proper water quality design and management practices for greenhouse development is necessary to ensure that greenhouse development will not adversely impact water quality or coastal resources. The Commission finds that the proposed amendments to the implementing zoning ordinance as submitted are inconsistent with and inadequate to carryout the requirements of the certified LUP resource protection policies. Suggested Modifications Seven (7), Ten (10), Seventeen (17), and Twenty (20) provide language to ensure that water quality is protected from potential adverse impacts related to greenhouse development.

For the above reasons, the Commission finds that the proposed LCP amendment, only as modified, is consistent with the water quality policies of the LUP and Sections 30230, 30231, and 30250 of the Coastal Act, as incorporated by reference into the LUP.

## **G. NEW DEVELOPMENT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

### **1. Coastal Act Policies**

Section 30105.5 defines cumulative:

***“Cumulatively” or “cumulative effect” means the effects of an individual project shall be reviewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.***

Section 30250 of the Coastal Act states, in relevant part:

***(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels...***

Section 30252 of the Coastal Act states:

***The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.***

Public Resources Code section 21083 provides:

***...project may have a 'significant effect on the environment' if any of the following conditions exist:...(b) the possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. As used in this subdivision, 'cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.***

## **2. Existing LUP Policies**

Policy 8-4 of the LCP states that:

***As a requirement for approval of any proposed land division of agricultural land designated as Agriculture I or II in the land use plan, the County shall make a finding that the long-term agricultural productivity of the property will not be diminished by the proposed division.***

Policy 8-5 of the LUP states:

***All greenhouse projects of 20,000 or more square feet and all additions to existing greenhouse development, i.e., greenhouse expansion, packing sheds, or other development for a total of existing and additions of 20,000 or more square feet, shall be subject to County discretionary approval and, therefore, subject to environmental review under County CEQA guidelines.***

***Prior to issuance of a development permit, the County shall make the findings based on information provided by environmental documents, staff analysis, and the applicant that all significant adverse impacts of the development as addressed in paragraphs "a" through "e" below have been identified and mitigated.***

### **Action**

***The County Resource Management Department shall develop procedures and standards for the environmental impact analysis of greenhouse developments. This action is necessary to ensure that all significant adverse impacts on coastal resources are identified and that mitigation measures are attached to projects as a condition of approval to mitigate individual and cumulative impacts. Such guidelines shall include an evaluation of the following factors for each project:***

- a. An assessment of the individual and cumulative increases in the amount and rate of runoff that would be caused by the proposed project and the potential impact on downstream watercourses. Mitigating measures shall be required to prevent runoff waters from entering overburdened water courses by directing runoff to water courses capable of handling the increased flow, or to collect the runoff and provide for drainage systems adequate to handle the increased flow.***
- b. If the project is located in a groundwater recharge area, a determination of the amount and rate of recharge that would occur if the site were uncovered and the net loss of recharge that will result from the project. Projects will be required to provide for the net potential loss of recharge that will result from the project through the use of impoundment basin where feasible or other means of collecting, storing, and percolating water for the purpose of recharging the groundwater basin.***
- c. Assessment of the impact of materials used for coverage and amount of coverage on the long-term productivity of soils.***

**d. Assessment of the potential adverse impacts of the project on the water quality of affected water bodies and groundwater basins.**

**To this end, the following information shall be required for each greenhouse project:**

- 1. the volume of water runoff or discharge during normal operating conditions and during the rainy season of the year.**
- 2. the types and amounts of pesticides and fertilizers contained in the runoff or discharge.**
- 3. the method for disposing of the runoff or discharge, i.e., a drainage plan, irrigation plan, or other means of determining how the runoff will be managed.**

**The County shall request the Regional Water Quality Control Board to review each greenhouse project for conformance with applicable State statutes and policies and to recommend mitigating measures where necessary. No discharge shall be permitted into enclosed bays and estuaries unless it can be shown that such discharge will not degrade the quality of the receiving waters. In addition, no detectable level of pesticide shall be discharged into surface waters. Mitigation means may include suspension of the runoff and redirection away from the affected waters, treatment of the runoff to remove toxicants and nutrients present, and/or monitoring of discharge from individual greenhouse projects.**

**To implement this policy in the Carpinteria Valley, a program for regular monitoring of the water quality of the Carpinteria Marsh and streams affected by greenhouse development shall be established (see also Recommendation 8, paragraph b(1), Section 3.9)**

**e. Assessment of the potential adverse impacts of the climate control aspects of the project on air quality.**

**In addition to the mitigating measures listed above, other measures necessary to mitigate any adverse impact identified as a result of the evaluation of these and other factors shall be required as a condition of project approval. In order to adequately assess the potential individual and cumulative impacts of greenhouse development on the coastal resources of the Carpinteria Valley, the County should conduct a master environmental impact assessment for the Valley to determine the level of greenhouse development that the Valley's resources can support without experiencing adverse environmental impacts. The County shall seek funding for the preparation of the master environmental impact assessment during the implementation phase of the Local Coastal Program. If the master environmental impact assessment is not completed within three years of the certification of the County's land use plan, greenhouse development (as regulated by Policy 8-5) shall automatically become a conditional use on Agriculture I designated lands in the Carpinteria Valley. If, however, the County and Coastal Commission agree**

***on land use designation or policy changes based on the County's assessment of adverse environmental impacts of greenhouses gathered through the permit process, conditional use permits shall not be required for greenhouse development.***

Policy 8-6 states:

***No greenhouse, hothouse, or accessory structures shall be located closer than 50 feet from the boundary line of a lot zoned residential. In addition, setback and maximum lot coverage requirements shall be as follows:***

<u>Parcel Size</u>	<u>Setbacks</u>	<u>Maximum Lot Coverage for All Structures</u>
Less than 5 acres	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and 20 feet from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	75 percent
5 to 9.99 acres	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	70 percent
10 acres or more	30 feet from the right-of-way of any street and from the lot lines of the parcel on which the greenhouse is located	65 percent

### **3. Existing IP/CZO Provisions**

Sec. 35-68.7 Setbacks for Buildings and Structures for AG-I Zone District

***1. Front: Fifty (50) feet from the centerline and twenty (20) feet from the right-of-way line of any street.***

***2. Side and Rear: Twenty (20) feet from the lot lines of the lot on which the building or structure is located.***

***3. Lots that contain one gross acre or less shall be subject to the setback regulations of the R-1/E-1 Single Family Residential District.***

***4. In addition, no hothouse, greenhouse, other plant protection, or related structure shall be located within thirty (30) feet of the right-of-way line of any street nor within fifty (50) feet of the lot line of a lot zoned residential. On lots containing five (5) or more gross acres, an additional setback of thirty (30) feet from the lot lines of the lot on which the structure is located is required.***

Sec. 35-68.8 Lot Coverage for AG-I Zone District

***The maximum net lot coverage for all hothouses, greenhouses, and other plant protection structures shall be as follows:***

<u>Lot Size</u>	<u>Maximum Lot Coverage</u>
Less than 5 acres	75 percent
5 to 9.99 acres	70 percent

10 acre or more

65 percent

#### **4. General Discussion**

The County's LCP recognizes that widespread, unmitigated greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley could have significant cumulative adverse impacts on coastal resources such as water quality, visual resources, access, and agricultural resources. LUP Policy 8-5(e) requires the County to conduct a master environmental assessment for the Carpinteria Valley to adequately address the potential individual and cumulative impacts of greenhouse development on coastal resources. The County was charged with the task of determining the level of greenhouse development that the valley's resources can support without experiencing adverse environmental impacts, and submitting this analysis for Commission consideration. The proposed Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program, as specified in this amendment, is the County's response to this requirement.

The proposed amendment includes modification of LUP Policy 8-5(e) to adopt the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District as approved by the Board of Supervisors on February 19, 2002, including general requirements and development standards to protect the water quality, visual resources, and rural character of the Carpinteria Valley. LUP Policy 8-5(e) also reflects the proposed 2.75 million sq. ft. development cap for all greenhouse and greenhouse related development within the designated expansion area.

Pursuant to modified LUP Policy 8-5(e), the County proposes to incorporate the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District to designate geographic areas of AG-I zoned lands in the Carpinteria Valley appropriate to support future greenhouse development, based upon the cumulative impacts analysis identified in the Revised Final EIR (February 19, 2002). The designated location for greenhouse expansion, Area A of the Overlay District, overlies 664 acres of agricultural lands in the Carpinteria Valley, encompassing 88 parcels. Area B is proposed to preserve open field agriculture and rural character, overlying the remaining 4,972 acres and encompassing 438 parcels. The Revised EIR reflects the changes in the project description as a result of modifications made by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors during the public hearing process. The Revised EIR project description represents the project parameters of the proposed LCP amendment. The revised project included a blanket designation of all AG-I zoned parcels north of Via Real, south of Highway 192, east of Nidever Road, and west of Linden Avenue, as available for intensified greenhouse expansion (Exhibit 12). The Revised EIR (page 5) found that "limiting major greenhouse development north and east of these roadways [Highway 192 and Linden Avenue] creates a defined, logical greenhouse expansion boundary that maintains development within and adjacent to historic clusters and preserves the rural character of the valley."

Along with the change in the expansion area boundary, the LCP amendment includes the deletion of maximum lot coverage requirements, except for the eleven designated view corridor parcels, which are intended to be offset by increased setback requirements. As proposed under this LCP amendment, the front setback is seventy-

five (75) feet from the right of way line of any street, irrespective of centerline and the interior lot setback was designated at twenty (20) feet from the lot lines on which the building or structure is located, as opposed to various requirements for odd-shaped lots. Additionally, residential setbacks were modified such that greenhouse development be setback one hundred (100) feet from a residentially-zoned lot or fifty (50) feet from an adjacent parcel where there is an approved residential dwelling located within fifty (50) feet of the parcel boundary. Finally, an additional setback of one hundred (100) feet from the top-of-bank or edge or riparian habitat of natural creek channels, whichever is greater, was imposed. The amendment further includes special provisions for the designated view corridor parcels. View corridor parcels are allowed maximum net lot coverage of 25% and greenhouse development on such parcels must be setback two hundred fifty (250) feet from the right of way line of any street.

Under the proposed amendment, Policy 8-6 would be modified to designate the above lot coverage, height, and setback requirements specific to greenhouse development in Carpinteria Valley. Lot coverage and setback requirements dictate the siting of greenhouse development to ensure compatibility with surrounding land uses and to minimize impacts of development to open space, scenic resources, open field agriculture, flood hazard, sensitive resources such as streams and creeks, and water quality.

The proposed LCP amendment allows for the continued development of greenhouses to a maximum of 20,000 sq. ft. on all parcels outside of the expansion zone, Area “B” of the Carpinteria Valley Agricultural Overlay District, which encompasses 4,972 acres of AG-I zoned parcels that are not designated for expansion. As provided in Section 35-102E.2 “Applicability and District Boundaries,” no more than 20,000 sq. ft. of cumulative greenhouse development is permitted per legal lot on Area B parcels. This requirement effectively regulates maximum lot coverage for Area B. However, it is not reported under the lot coverage requirements listed in proposed Policy 8-6. Policy 8-6 clearly defines lot coverage to include all greenhouses, shade and hoop structures, packing and shipping facilities, and greenhouse related development, including accessory buildings, and associated paved driveways and parking areas. The Commission finds that the 20,000 sq. ft. lot coverage requirement for Area B lots is more appropriately located in the section where lot coverage is specifically designated and assigned under Policy 8-6. To ensure internal consistency and clarity, the Commission suggests Modification Two (2) to specify the maximum cumulative lot coverage of 20,000 sq. ft. of greenhouse development in Area B, under Policy 8-6 which assigns lot coverage requirements. In addition, to ensure implementation plan consistency with suggested Modification Two, the Commission suggests the identical changes be made to Section 35-102E.8 which assign lot coverage requirements in the Article II Zoning Code, pursuant to Modification Eleven (11).

## **5. Greenhouse Development Permitting**

LUP Policy 8-5 provides the policy basis for greenhouse regulation in the LCP. Pursuant to Policy 8-5, greenhouse development permits are granted ministerially by the County through their coastal development permit process, unless cumulative greenhouse

development is 20,000 sq. ft. or more. Under the current code, if greenhouse expansion, packing sheds, or other development total 20,000 or more square feet, the project requires County discretionary approval and is subject to environmental review under County CEQA guidelines. Specifically, Policy 8-5 requires (see Exhibit 6, page 9):

- Greenhouse projects of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, including any additions to existing greenhouse development “shall be subject to County discretionary approval and, therefore, subject to environmental review under County CEQA guidelines.”
- Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, the County is required to make findings “that all significant adverse impacts of the development as addressed in paragraphs “a” through “e” below have been identified and mitigated:
  - a. requires an assessment of the individual and cumulative increases in the amount and rate of runoff that would be caused by the proposed project and the potential impact on downstream water courses.
  - b. requires a determination of the amount and rate of recharge that would occur if the site were uncovered and the net loss of recharge that would result from a project proposed in a groundwater recharge area.
  - c. requires an assessment of the impact of materials used for coverage and amount of coverage on the long-term productivity of soils.
  - d. requires an assessment of the potential adverse impacts of the project on surface and groundwater quality. In Carpinteria Valley, a program was specifically required for regular monitoring of water quality of Carpinteria Marsh and streams.
  - e. requires an assessment of the potential adverse impacts of climate control on air quality.
- Specific provisions were made for the Carpinteria Valley in addition to the above items. In order to adequately address the “potential individual and cumulative impacts of greenhouse development” on coastal resources, the County was tasked with conducting a “master environmental impact assessment for the Valley to determine the level of greenhouse development that the Valley’s resources can support without experiencing adverse environmental impacts.” If the master environmental assessment was not completed within three years of the certification of the County’s land use plan, all subsequent greenhouse development would automatically become a conditional use in AG-I zoned properties in the Carpinteria Valley. Upon implementation of the master environmental assessment, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would not be required for greenhouse development, once agreed upon by the County and Coastal Commission.

As indicated in the bulleted paragraph above, the County was tasked with developing a master environmental assessment. If such a document was not agreed upon by the County and Commission, then greenhouse development would require application



through the CUP process. Although a master environmental assessment was not completed within the prescribed three years, the County did not begin issuing appealable CUPs. In 1986 the Board of Supervisors approved the document *Greenhouse Development in Carpinteria Valley: A Compilation and Assessment of Existing Information* as the master environmental assessment. The County did not bring this to the Commission, but determined that a Development Plan rather than a CUP would be required to process new greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley. In the interim, greenhouse development in the Valley nearly doubled from the time of certification of the LCP. The fact that the County was not issuing CUPs for new greenhouse development in Carpinteria Valley was brought to the Commission staff's attention in the late 1990s as a result of Commission Appeal A-4-STB-98-057 and a statement was issued to the County Board of Supervisors in 1998 identifying the error in procedure. The County began the subject greenhouse program development process shortly thereafter. As a result, a CUP and Development Plan are required for all new greenhouses and related development (i.e., packing sheds and other accessory structures) over 20,000 sq. ft. in Carpinteria Valley.

Pursuant to the proposed LCP amendment, greenhouses, accessory structures, and temporary structures such as shade structures would continue to be permitted by ministerial coastal development permit provided such structures meet certain qualifying criteria, comply with the necessary development standards, and are not larger than 20,000 sq. ft. Structures that are 20,000 sq. ft. or greater, anywhere in the County except Area B, would be permitted through a Development Permit. Packing and shipping facilities greater than 5,000 sq. ft. would require a Minor CUP.

As mentioned above, greenhouse development of 20,000 or more square feet, cumulative per parcel, anywhere in the County requires discretionary action by the County. The AG-I and AG-II zone districts require this discretionary action to be in the form of a Development Plan. The findings required to approve a project under the County's CUP process are essentially identical to the findings required under the County's Development Plan permit process (Exhibits 4 and 5), with the exception that the County must find under the CUP process that the project is "not inconsistent with the intent of the zone district." Additionally, the CUP provides a mechanism to revoke the permit due to non-compliance; and provides an appeal process to the Coastal Commission. The proposed amendment would eliminate the requirement for a CUP in the Carpinteria Valley. As a result, future greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley would no longer be appealable.

## **6. Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Development**

The County estimates that there are 14.9 million square feet of greenhouse and greenhouse related development within the Carpinteria Valley. At 14.9 million square feet and growing, the Carpinteria Valley Planning area is a predominant greenhouse site in Santa Barbara County. Greenhouse development was known to be an important issue during the development of the LCP in the late 1970's and early 1980's due to the growth of the industry within the Carpinteria Valley. At the time of the LCP certification, greenhouse and greenhouse related development was approximately eight million

square feet in the Carpinteria Valley. The total has nearly doubled since certification. Because of the adverse impacts to the environment from this structural agriculture, the certified LCP made special provisions for the Carpinteria Valley.

The proposed LCP amendment would result in the addition of an overlay district to identify the appropriate area for the location and intensity of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley and where unique public viewsheds, prime agriculture, natural assets and community character require protection under the Coastal Act. The overlay district is also intended to designate areas of agricultural lands in the Carpinteria Valley appropriate to support future greenhouse development. The Carpinteria Valley has attributes that make it particularly suitable for agricultural development, including mild climatic conditions, prime agricultural soils, available water sources, and proximity to major markets. These conditions are similarly advantageous to growers with greenhouse operations. For instance, the solar exposure and mild climate contribute to easier and less expensive to control of greenhouse temperatures.

Additionally, the LCP amendment proposes additions to LUP Policy 8-5 to address what information would be necessary to consider an amendment to the greenhouse development cap, and specific Carpinteria Valley greenhouse related issues such as traffic and transportation improvements, water quality, farm worker housing, and watershed management. This allows the future consideration of an increase in the development cap in Area A, depending upon market conditions and demand for greenhouse grown products. This is appropriate only for Area A because it is the designated expansion area for greenhouse development, it is committed to greenhouse development, and greenhouse impacts can be clustered and minimized.

As described in detail in the Agriculture, Visual and Public Access, and Water Quality sections of this staff report, greenhouse development can have a myriad of adverse effects on coastal resources. Individually, impacts may be mitigated to minimize their effect; however, they may also contribute incrementally to cumulative adverse impacts. The cumulative effects of uncontrolled and extensive greenhouse development are particularly evident in the Carpinteria Valley.

The County prepared the Greenhouse Program EIR in response to the LCP requirement to prepare a master environmental assessment of the cumulative impact of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley. The EIR found that uncontrolled buildout of greenhouse development within Carpinteria Valley would have adverse environmental impacts. The incremental conversion of open field agriculture and open space to a structural developed landscape, if not controlled, has the potential to adversely impact visual resources, water quality, access, long-term preservation of agriculture, and rural character as a result of landform alteration, covering of prime soils, addition of truck traffic, introduction of pesticides or fertilizers into water bodies, acceleration of stormwater runoff and flooding, and loss of foraging area for raptors.

To mitigate the cumulative adverse impacts of greenhouse buildout, the EIR evaluated various locations to concentrate future greenhouse expansion in the Carpinteria Valley

and evaluated various development densities. The EIR for this project recommended rezoning in the Carpinteria Valley to designate expansion areas based upon proximity to existing historic greenhouse clusters, parcel visibility, distance from adjacent incompatible land uses (residential, schools, etc.), distance from water courses, existing crop type, and parcel size. These criteria were established to promote future greenhouse expansion adjacent to existing greenhouse clusters and avoid piecemeal expansion of greenhouses into open field areas. The expansion areas are intended to provide specific locations where greenhouse development expansion of 20,000 sq. ft. or greater is allowed. In addition, development standards and permitting procedures were developed to guide the approval of new greenhouse projects. The non-expansion areas were intended to designate parcels for the preservation of open field agriculture and to provide standards that would promote and support open field operations as a long-term viable use by limiting expansion of greenhouses and related intensive infrastructure improvements. The open field agricultural areas would permit greenhouse development of less than 20,000 sq. ft. cumulative per parcel. Greenhouse development of less than 20,000 sq. ft. is presently a permitted use in the AG-I zone district and would remain unchanged in both the expansion and non-expansion areas.

Four alternatives were assessed in the EIR: (1) No Project Alternative; (2) High Buildout Alternative; (3) Low Buildout Alternative; and (4) the Preferred Alternative. The *No Project Alternative* assumes that LCP policies, zoning requirements, and other county plans, policies, and programs now in effect would continue to apply. Under the No Project Alternative, applications for greenhouse development of greater than 20,000 sq. ft. would continue to be processed on a case-by-case basis through a major conditional use permit with no restrictions on the location of such development within the AG-I zone district. Under this option, development standards would be identified through individual environmental impact analysis and permit review. This alternative assumes a steady growth rate, approximating annual greenhouse development at 300,000 sq. ft. per year (approximately 3 million sq. ft. of greenhouse development was approved within the study area between 1989-1999) according to the EIR. Therefore, the no project alternative represents approximately 4.5 million sq. ft. of greenhouse expansion, over a 15-year planning horizon.

The *Low Buildout Alternative* designates approximately 394 acres for potential intensive greenhouse development. This alternative relies primarily on buildout of parcels with existing greenhouses to their maximum potential consistent with proposed development standards and the redevelopment (retrofit) of older greenhouses. Buildout of this alternative would allow approximately 2.2 million sq. ft. of new greenhouse development in a limited area primarily, north of Via Real, south of Highway 192, east of Nidever Road, and west of Linden Avenue. One additional area identified for intensified development under the low buildout alternative is an existing greenhouse cluster in the southeast corner of the intersection of Casitas Pass Road and Highway 192.

The *High Buildout Alternative* designates approximately 519 acres for potential greenhouse expansion. These expansion areas overlap the low build out, but designate an additional 125 acres for intensive development based on emerging greenhouse

clusters north of Highway 192 and east of Casitas Pass Road. This alternative would allow for a total buildout of approximately 4.2 million sq. ft. of greenhouse development.

The *Preferred Alternative* identified in the EIR (March 2000) represents a medium buildout level, allowing for approximately 3 million square feet of potential intensive greenhouse development over 462 acres. The expansion area is generally located south of Highway 192 between Nidever Road and Linden Avenue. However, there are two other greenhouse clusters included in the expansion area, including one north of Highway 192 west of Linden Avenue and one east of Casitas Pass Road and south of Highway 192.

Buildout for each of these alternatives was calculated based on analysis of the remaining development potential of parcels located within the proposed expansion areas, as well as the maximum allowable square footage for undeveloped parcels based on the proposed setback and building coverage requirements. Lot coverage was defined to include all greenhouse and greenhouse related structures, parking, accessory buildings, and retention basins. Lot coverage buildout calculations were based on the existing gradation of lot coverage requirements approved in the certified LCP, such that parcels less than five acres are allowed 75% maximum lot coverage, lots from 5 to 9.99 acres are allowed 70% maximum lot coverage, and lots 10 acres or more are allowed 65% maximum lot coverage. The setbacks evaluated under the alternatives analysis were similar to the existing greenhouse development setbacks: front setbacks of fifty (50) feet from the centerline and thirty (30) feet from the right of way line of any street; side and rear setbacks of thirty (30) feet from the lot lines on which the building or structures is located; and additionally, no structures shall be located within fifty (50) feet of any residentially zoned lot or any adjacent lot with an approved residential use. The setbacks above are different from existing setbacks in the following ways: (1) existing standards within the certified LCP require only 20-foot side and rear setbacks and (2) existing certified LCP language requires lots containing five or more gross acres to have an additional setback of thirty (30) feet from the lot lines of the lot on which the structure is located.

Section 30250 of the Coastal Act requires that new development not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. The Commission recognizes that siting future intensive greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley is appropriately based upon proximity to existing historic greenhouse clusters, parcel visibility, distance from adjacent incompatible land uses, distance from water courses, existing crop type, and parcel size, consistent with Section 30250. Section 30250 also requires the clustering of development within or near existing development areas able to accommodate it.

As noted earlier in these findings, there are clear distinctions between open field agricultural production and greenhouse agricultural production. These distinctions include a structural presence that is visually similar to a typical commercial/industrial development, the potential to impact public views, interfere with public access, increase runoff, cover agricultural soils, reduce foraging habitat, increase glare and light pollution,

modify landforms and change rural character. In addition to the physical similarities, greenhouse operation is comparable to factory operations, with 24-hour, 7-day-per-week operations, additional traffic, use of energy, lighting, loading/unloading operations, and the need for permanent facilities for employees such as parking and restrooms. Thus in many ways these greenhouses function like an industrial agricultural use, rather than a traditional agricultural use and the associated impacts are fundamentally more significant upon coastal resources.

A hybrid alternative is proposed under the subject LCP amendment to cluster greenhouse development South of Foothill Road between Nidever Road and Linden Avenue, an area roughly encompassing 9 million square feet of existing greenhouse development. Based on the Area A (greenhouse expansion area) boundaries and lot coverage and setbacks, the County estimates a maximum greenhouse buildout potential of approximately 8.6 million sq. ft. in the proposed Area A of the overlay district. However, as provided in the proposed amendment, the County imposes a development cap of 2.75 million square feet of total greenhouse development (excluding shade structures) in Area A. Area B (rural zone) allows for a maximum of 20,000 sq. ft. of greenhouse and greenhouse related development per parcel. The County adopted Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the project, finding that impacts related to visual resources, land use, and traffic were considered potentially significant but unavoidable, in essence recognizing the potential cumulative impacts to coastal resources as a result of the proposed amendment.

The proposed policies and overlay district are devised to mitigate impacts and control the density of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley. The Overlay District requires greenhouse development to meet height, lot coverage, setbacks, and development standards to minimize environmental impacts and ensure compatibility of land uses. Greenhouses are a historical agricultural use in this area, and are recognized as such by the certified LCP. When viewed on a countywide basis, the delineation of the expansion area under the proposed Carpinteria Valley Overlay District is consistent with the clustering requirement for new development and avoidance of significant cumulative impacts to coastal resources as required under Section 30250 of the Coastal Act. When evaluated countywide, the Carpinteria Valley is committed to greenhouse operations, and as proposed, major greenhouse expansion will be restricted to 664 acres of the Carpinteria Valley. By creating an expansion area, the application of the overlay district is similar to setting an urban-rural limit line, between greenhouses and rural agriculture. Therefore, on a countywide cumulative basis, this is the preferred alternative which allows for some additional expansion of greenhouse development in the appropriate clustered area but serves to protect the rural character of Area B and, as modified through Modification Twenty (20), other locations of the County (see further discussion below for Modification 20).

The Commission finds that a development cap will limit the intensity and density of greenhouse development allowed within Area A, thereby minimizing total potential cumulative impacts to coastal resources. Under the subject LCP amendment, the County is proposing a development cap of 2.75 million sq. ft. of greenhouse and

greenhouse related development, excluding shade structures, within Area A (the designated expansion area). Given that the calculation of buildout is intended as a planning tool to guide future planning and development, the Commission finds that the 2.75 million sq. ft. development cap will serve as an adequate target to ensure that maximum future greenhouse development is defined for the expansion areas and is adequate to minimize cumulative impacts to coastal resources. Further, additional provisions provided under the overlay district, as modified, serve to minimize cumulative impacts of greenhouse development as discussed in previous sections.

Additionally, clustering greenhouse development in areas that are already visually degraded and have infrastructure to support such development minimizes cumulative impacts to visual resources, infrastructure, and open space. To ensure that new greenhouse development in the study area is sited with existing compatible greenhouse development, the Commission suggests Modification One (1) to Section 3.2 (New Development) of the LUP to specifically designate clustering of future intensified greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley. Modification 1 suggests the addition of a policy for all greenhouse and greenhouse related development within the Carpinteria Valley that is 20,000 sq. ft. or greater (cumulative per parcel) to be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to existing greenhouse development to preserve the scenic values and rural character of the Carpinteria Valley. Furthermore, Modification 1 will ensure clarification of the hierarchy of the LCP policies, such that the LUP shall guide implementation, thereby avoiding internal conflicts within the LCP that could hinder effective LCP implementation.

## **7. Countywide Greenhouse Development**

Section 30250 requires that new development be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it... and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. Section 30252 requires that the location and amount of new development maintain and enhance public access to the coast by extending transit services, minimizing traffic-trips on coastal access roads, providing for nonautomobile circulation and adequate parking, among other means. As discussed more fully in Section VII of this report, the Coastal Commission is the lead agency responsible for reviewing Local Coastal Programs for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Secretary of Resources Agency has determined that the Commission's program of reviewing and certifying LCPs qualifies for certification under Section 21080.5 of CEQA.

To fulfill CEQA requirements, review of LCP amendments must consider the cumulative effects of the proposed amendment. As provided in Public Resources Code section 21083, a "project may have a 'significant effect on the environment' if any of the following conditions exist:...(b) the possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. As used in this subdivision, 'cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects."

As noted above, greenhouses are a historical agricultural use in this area, and much of the Carpinteria Valley is already committed to greenhouse development. When viewed on a countywide basis, the delineation of the expansion area under the proposed Carpinteria Valley Overlay District is consistent with the clustering requirement for new development and avoidance of significant cumulative impacts to coastal resources as required under Section 30250 of the Coastal Act. When evaluated countywide, the Carpinteria Valley is committed to greenhouse operations, and as proposed, major greenhouse expansion will be restricted to 664 acres of the Carpinteria Valley. Therefore on a cumulative countywide basis, the Commission finds that the 2.75 million sq. ft. of greenhouse development allowed in Area A will cluster greenhouse development consistent with Section 30250, provided that the potential spread of greenhouse development is limited as described in Suggested Modification Twenty (20). Modification 20 limits the uncontrolled intensification of greenhouse development and associated impacts in potential overflow areas of the County by requiring a Major Conditional Use Permit for agricultural areas outside of the Carpinteria Valley Overlay District. The approval of a CUP by the presiding decision-maker would require specific findings with regard to coastal resources, including slopes, water quality standards, extension of water and sewage lines, visual resources and rural character, conversion of foraging habitat, coastal access, recreation, traffic, and proximity to other greenhouse development. By making these resource conclusions on a case-by-case basis for future greenhouse development within the County, it ensures that greenhouse development will only be approved in locations able to accommodate that type of development without significant adverse impacts to coastal resources.

As detailed above, the Commission recognizes that locating intensive greenhouse development appropriately, is the first step to mitigate the cumulative impacts of greenhouse development on coastal resources. The proposed policies and Overlay District are devised to mitigate impacts and control the density of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley. The Commission finds that the potential buildout of greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley, if it continues under present trends and regulation, has the potential to transform the rural valley to a structured, quasi-industrial landscape. The incremental conversion of the open space to a structural developed landscape, if not controlled has the potential to adversely impact water quality, flooding, agriculture, visual resources, and rural character of the Carpinteria Valley. As a result, Area A of the Overlay District, as proposed, is necessary to locate the Valley's greenhouse expansion area and ensure that greenhouse development is controlled in a manner consistent with Section 30250 of the Coastal Act.

However, the Commission also recognizes that the assignment of the development cap and development standards required in the Carpinteria Valley have the potential to contribute to the buildout of greenhouses in other locations, including other suitable Santa Barbara County coastal locations. Growers in Carpinteria Valley have indicated a strong demand for large-scale greenhouses operations and have underscored the profitability of greenhouse production as supported by correspondence in the public record and testimony at the April Commission hearing. Additional indication of the strong demand for greenhouses is supported by the Santa Barbara County Flower and

Nursery Growers Association litigation over the adequacy of the Carpinteria Valley Greenhouse Program EIR. The Santa Barbara County Flower and Nursery Growers Association has argued that “the zoning before the Project [i.e., without the proposed Overlay District and development standards] and market forces would have inevitably led to open fields being converted to greenhouses.” Furthermore, the Santa Barbara County Flower and Nursery Growers Association has argued that:

***The very heart of the Project is the proposal to designate one geographical agricultural area in the Carpinteria Valley where agricultural property owners cannot “choose” to grow greenhouse crops instead of open field crops...A change from one type of crop to another in response to market conditions or consumer demand is common in the agriculture industry. The ability to convert open field agriculture to greenhouses in an example of that type of shift. The reality is that the open field Area B deprives landowners of an important business option and has the potential to produce results entirely inconsistent with the stated policy desire to preserve agriculture uses.***

Additionally, the President of the Santa Barbara Flower Growers Association supported a higher cap in his June 8, 2001 correspondence:

***We respectfully recommend that the Board of Supervisors consider a square footage cap for greenhouse growth and expansion of 3.35 million square feet over the next ten (10) year period for the Carpinteria Greenhouse Study Area. This represents a more reasonable expectation of growth given that the No Project Alternative per the EIR was 4.5 million square feet and the original staff proposed Project per the EIR was 3,044,756 square feet.***

The above statements indicate that the large-scale conversion of open field agriculture to greenhouses is a potential reality, depending upon the unpredictable market forces. And as discussed previously, controlled greenhouse conditions optimize yields to allow growers to specialize in hard-to-grow varieties with less competition abroad which results in substantially larger returns per acre. Increased competition from abroad has contributed to the conversion of open field agriculture to greenhouse operations. As a result, interest in greenhouses is not limited to the Carpinteria Valley.

In addition to the concentrated greenhouse development within the Carpinteria Valley, pressure for greenhouse development is in demand in other locations of Santa Barbara County. For example, existing greenhouse development is present and has increased in the nearby South Patterson area of unincorporated Goleta. At present, Santa Barbara County is processing an application for 1.5 million square feet of greenhouse development in the South Patterson area, an indicator of the scale of the demand in Santa Barbara County. Other areas of greenhouse development in Santa Barbara County include scattered areas in Lompoc and the area east of Santa Maria. However, in addition to areas that presently experience some greenhouse development, the certified LCP and zoning code allow greenhouses as a principal permitted use on all AG-I and AG-II zoned lands (see details in the section above on Greenhouse Development Permitting). Large-scale greenhouse development would not be appropriate in many cases. Greenhouse development would be particularly detrimental in rural scenic areas such as the Gaviota coast. The Gaviota Coast Planning Area,



spanning the coastline from the Ellwood Pier to Gaviota, is an area of unique scenic value with expansive ocean, canyons, and foothills. It also provides recreational resources of state-wide importance. This area also experiences agricultural activity, including a greenhouse development cluster west of the Naples townsite.

The issues associated with the growth and expansion of greenhouse development is not limited to the Carpinteria Valley alone within the Santa Barbara County coastal zone. This issue must be considered in the broader context of the entire LCP geographic jurisdiction, particularly all areas designated for agricultural development. It is clear, based on prior history of greenhouse development within the Carpinteria Valley, concerns raised by growers relative to proposed limitations (i.e. development cap) on greenhouse development, technological reasons for utilizing greenhouses relative to climate and productivity, and more recent proposals for greenhouse development along Patterson Avenue (1.5 million sq. ft. of greenhouse development) that the demand for greenhouse development will increase in the future. While up to 2.75 million sq. ft. of additional greenhouse development will be allowed in the Carpinteria Valley as a result of this amendment it is almost certainly not adequate to meet all future demand within the County. Further, as provided in the subject LCP amendment, greenhouse development in the Carpinteria Valley will be subject to additional policies and regulations to address and mitigate the potential adverse impacts on maintaining the productivity of prime agricultural lands, visual resources, and water quality. Although the County's LCP does contain policies which address these issues, no specific policies that address these issues relative to greenhouse development in particular exist within the LCP for agricultural areas outside of the Carpinteria Valley. Because of the demand driven potential for expansion of greenhouse development in the County and the unique nature of the impacts and issues associated with greenhouses, as demonstrated by development within the Carpinteria Valley over the past 20 years, it is important that the LCP recognize and address these issues throughout the County coastal zone and not just within the Carpinteria Valley. Therefore, additional modifications are proposed which add a policy that requires a Conditional Use Permit, along with specific findings which must be made in order to approve the CUP, for any proposed greenhouse or greenhouse related development that exceeds 20,000 sq. ft. in size on any parcel within the County's LCP jurisdiction outside of the Carpinteria Valley.

The pressure for additional greenhouse development combined with the LCP amendment to regulate greenhouse development in Carpinteria Valley is anticipated to push demand into other locations that do not have similar restrictions and are able to accommodate such development. Therefore, an unintended consequence of the proposed LCP amendment is the relocation of the cumulative impacts of greenhouse development from the Carpinteria Valley to alternative locations. If the same requirements to protect water quality, visual resources, agricultural resources, and prime agricultural soil are not applied elsewhere in the County, it creates an incentive for greenhouses to be developed outside of Carpinteria. Given the empirical evidence of Carpinteria Valley's unmitigated level of greenhouse development since the LCP's certification, a countywide modification is necessary to mitigate the accelerated impacts to other County areas. Therefore the Commission requires Suggested Modifications

Seven (7) and Twenty (20) to ensure that greenhouses throughout the County are sited and designed to avoid adverse impacts to coastal resources. These modifications require that all greenhouses and greenhouse related development (e.g., packing sheds, driveways, parking, etc.), including all additions to existing greenhouse or greenhouse related development, that result in a total of 20,000 sq. ft. or more of cumulative development per parcel, obtain a Major CUP in any agriculturally designated zone district. This requirement applies on a countywide basis, unless the area is within the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. A Major CUP is also required for greenhouse development of any size where greenhouse or greenhouse related development is proposed on slopes greater than five percent. The CUP can only be approved when the approving body makes specific findings with regard to coastal resources, including slopes, water quality standards, extension of water and sewage lines, visual resources and rural character, conversion of foraging habitat, coastal access, recreation, traffic, and proximity to other greenhouse development.

The benefits of the CUP requirement are three-fold: (1) findings must be made by the decision-maker which specifically address the aspects of greenhouse development that could, individually or cumulatively, adversely impact coastal resources; (2) the CUP provides a mechanism to revoke the permit due to non-compliance; and (3) the CUP provides an appeal process to the Coastal Commission. Overall, the CUP process would require environmental review, the LUP Policy 8-5 findings, specific greenhouse CUP findings, and the standard findings required for CUPs.

Modification 20 modifies AG-I and AG-II zone district *Permitted Uses* and *Uses permitted with a Major Conditional Use Permit* sections. Modification 20 includes the addition of a new section in the AG-I and AG-II zone districts, *Findings for Major Conditional Use Permit for Greenhouse Development*.

As provided in the resource portions of this report, greenhouse development may contribute to cumulative impacts on visual resources, water quality impacts, coastal access and traffic. To ensure that greenhouse development is adequately sited to avoid significant landform alteration which would adversely impact visual resources and water quality, the approving body must make a finding that the project is not proposed on a slope greater than 10 percent. As discussed in detail in the Visual Resources Section of this report, agricultural lands with slopes in excess of 5% are typically unsuitable for greenhouse development. However, given the variability in siting and design of greenhouses, greenhouse development have the potential to be situated to avoid impacts consistent with the Coastal Act. Therefore, rather than prohibit all development on slopes greater than 5%, Modification 20 prohibits development on greater than 10% slopes and requires a discretionary action (CUP) for greenhouse development proposed on slopes between 5 and 10 percent.

Two other findings must be made to ensure that greenhouse development will not adversely impact visual resources, either individually or cumulatively, consistent with Section 30251 of the Coastal Act: (1) that the project will not adversely affect public coastal views, alter the character of rural open space and open field agricultural and

grazing areas, or contribute light pollution to night skies in rural areas and (2) that development is located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to existing greenhouse development to preserve scenic value and rural character.

To ensure consistency with Coastal Act sections 30230, 30231, and 30240 to protect coastal waters, biological productivity, and sensitive species, the approving body must make a finding that the project meets applicable water quality development standards, as outlined in the Carpinteria Agricultural Overlay District. The water quality findings would require mitigation for increased stormwater runoff; standards for on-site septic systems; proper storage of compost, fertilizer, and pesticides; appropriate disposal of waste brine; minimization of hardscape features; planting of vegetative cover to encourage stormwater infiltration and reduce runoff to the maximum extent feasible; implementation of post-construction structural treatment control as necessary; preparation of a water quality management plan, and installation of an irrigation water detention system if deemed necessary by Planning and Development. The decision-maker must make two other applicable findings: that the project will not require the extension of water and sewage disposal lines and that the conversion of foraging habitat to structural development is fully mitigated.

Coastal routes may be directly or indirectly impacted as a result of increased greenhouse development. To carry out the public access provisions of the Coastal Act, the approving body must also make a CUP finding that the project will not adversely affect coastal access or recreation, including through increased traffic conflicts.

As a result of making the above findings in order to approve a CUP for greenhouse development outside of the Carpinteria Valley, the amendment as modified as suggested would be designed to mitigate the indirect cumulative impacts associated with the 2.75 million development cap and development standards for greenhouses in Carpinteria Valley. Smaller scale greenhouse operations under 20,000 sq. ft. anywhere in the County would not need to obtain a CUP if located on five percent slopes or less. Furthermore, since the CUP requirement outlines the criteria (i.e., findings) to permit additional large-scale greenhouse development within the County, it provides the public and the Commission the ability to appeal such development based upon a differing interpretation of the criteria.

The Commission therefore finds that the proposed LUP amendments as submitted are inconsistent with and inadequate to carryout the requirements of Section 30250 of the Coastal Act unless modified as suggested above. Furthermore, the proposed IP amendments are not consistent with or adequate to carryout the provisions of the LUP, as modified, unless modified as suggested above.

## **VII.CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**

Pursuant to Section 21080.9 of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the Coastal Commission is the lead agency responsible for reviewing Local Coastal Programs for compliance with CEQA. The Secretary of Resources Agency has

determined that the Commission's program of reviewing and certifying LCPs qualifies for certification under Section 21080.5 of CEQA. In addition to making the finding that the LCP amendment is in full compliance with CEQA, the Commission must make a finding that no less environmentally damaging feasible alternative exists. Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) of CEQA and Section 13540(f) of the California Code of Regulations require that the Commission not approve or adopt a LCP, "...if there are feasible alternative or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact which the activity may have on the environment."

The proposed amendment is to the County of Santa Barbara's certified Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Implementation Ordinance. The Commission originally certified the County of Santa Barbara's Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Implementation Ordinance in 1981 and 1982, respectively. For the reasons discussed in this report, the LCP amendment, as submitted is inconsistent with the applicable policies of the Coastal Act and the certified Land Use Plan and feasible alternatives and mitigation are available which would lessen any significant adverse effect which the approval would have on the environment. The Commission has, therefore, modified the proposed LCP amendment to include such feasible measures adequate to ensure that such environmental impacts of new development are minimized. As discussed in the preceding section, the Commission's suggested modifications bring the proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan components of the LCP into conformity with the Coastal Act and certified Land Use Plan. Therefore, the Commission finds that the LCP amendment, as modified, is consistent with CEQA and the Land Use Plan.